



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 601/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, November 5, 2008 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Stephen Lee

Alyce Conti

Henry Matthews

Tom Veith

Vernon Abelsen

Marie Strong

Christine Howard

Mark Hannum

Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Sarah Sodt

Karen Gordon

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Mollie Tremaine

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:30 P.M.

Ms. Conti and Ms. Howard arrived at 3:32 P.M.

110508.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of September 17, 2008

MM/SC/MS/MH

8:0:0 Minutes approved as amended.

Meeting of October 1, 2008

The minutes of this meeting were deferred.

110508.2

SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

110508.21

Medical Dental Building

509 Olive Way

Karen Gordon explained Special Tax Valuation program.

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Mr. Veith arrived at 3:34 p.m.

Ms. Gordon stated the Medical Dental Building received Special Tax Valuation in 2006 and 2007 and this is the third phase of the project which is completing the renovation of the interior and exterior of the building. She explained the disallowed expenses and stated that even with that this clearly meets the percentage of rehabilitation at 62%; the threshold is 25%. It is a designated landmark with an Ordinance.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee stated the work done has been good and supported approval.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Medical Dental Building, 509 Olive Way, 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/MH/MS 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110508.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

110508.31 Arctic Building
700 Third Avenue
Proposed signage

Ms. Sodt introduced Willard Park from Rainier Industries and stated that the application has been reviewed by ARC.

Mr. Park explained the application for signage and stated the new sign would be installed on an existing sign panel that has a stucco finish on it. The lettering will be ½” aluminum with painted finish. There is one logo off to the left side as shown on the drawing with 3 gooseneck lights above the signage that have a gloss black finish.

Ms. Strong asked if it was different space from the café/bakery.

Mr. Park explained it is the same storefront, and that the business signage proposed is for the bakery.

Mr. Lee stated because of the height between the top of the windows and the pavement they can't do awnings; they are just attaching the sign to the existing sign panel; ARC has no issues with the application. He said the lighting fixtures are attached to the panel not to the terracotta.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee stated that it is straightforward and ARC had no problem with the application.

Mr. Veith agreed and stated it was an obvious solution that doesn't damage material that the Board is trying to protect.

Mr. Abelsen agreed it was a reasonable approach.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage and lighting. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 116969 because the proposed alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/HM/CH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110508.4 DESIGNATIONS

110508.41 Securities Building
1904 Third Avenue

Sarah Sodt introduced Architectural Historian, Kate Krafft, who would present the report for the City. The building is a Category 1 building in the Downtown survey.

Kate Krafft explained the building was constructed in three phases: 1913, 1925 and 1947. She provided context of the site and said the building meets several of the criteria. She said it meets Criterion B. James W. Clise was a land developer and capitalist who acquired eastern monies and was instrumental in land acquisition and development in downtown Seattle immediately after the Seattle Fire. He played an important role at the AYP and was instrumental in opposing the Bogue Plan. He had a gentleman's farm on what is now Marymoor Park. The building is also associated with Frank P. Allen, Jr., an engineer and architect was the Director of Works at the Alaska Yukon Pacific Exposition and who later went on to be Director of the San Diego Exposition in 1914. John Graham, Jr. and David Myers developed the initial design for the project before Mr. Allen prepared the final design. There is some belief that John Graham took over the project and coordinated the construction. Graham was associated with several significant properties: Frederick and Nelson, the Exchange Building and many others. Henry Bittman designed the 1925 and 1947 additions and worked on a number of significant properties downtown including the Terminal Sales Building.

Ms. Krafft said the building meets Criterion C because it is the first major commercial building to be constructed in the Denny Regrade area and was the only one constructed north of Stewart Street. Construction didn't proceed until the Bogue Plan was defeated with Mr. Clise's involvement. The building is associated with the Smith Tower which was built about the same time and both buildings have Mexican Onyx cladding in their lobbies.

Ms. Krafft said the building meets Criterion D for its Beaux Arts design mode. It was originally designed to be a full block project but just the south portion was completed. It features of Beaux Arts design: the distinctive base, shaft and capital, and segmental arched windows and window bays. She pointed out the white rusticated terracotta, ornamental iron spandrels at the bay, with terracotta ornament. She pointed out the 1925 and 1947 additions. Other ornamental elemental elements include entry way scalloped swag treatment, fluted columns, rusticated treatment of the terracotta and rich cornice treatment with the brackets and dentil course. She said the terracotta elements with the "S" that probably stands for "Smith". She exhibited photos of the interior which showed the Mexican Onyx, the Venetian glass tile flooring, marble base, original ceiling that has been restored, the skylights, the elevator bank with the original surrounds and panels above.

Ms. Krafft said with regard to Criterion F the building is prominent from various viewpoints but particularly where the street ends on 4th and showed photos to illustrate that.

She explained there are some integrity issues: the cap and cornice were altered; the base and store fronts were altered; and the lobby was altered. There are also impacts from the 1925 and 1957 additions. The entry was significantly altered in the 1960s. The frames to the skylights are original but the glass is new. The elevator door surrounds are original but the doors appear to be new. In 1947 this was the first major construction after the Depression and WWII era.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the elevators were built as shown on the drawings.

Ms. Krafft pointed out on the photo that the doors appear to be glass fronts like the design in the drawings.

Mr. Matthews asked about the removal of the cornice.

Ms. Krafft stated the removal was in character with the design of the 1947 addition and thinks it was removed to unify the design of the two buildings.

Mr. Hannum asked about the terrazzo floor steps in the Stewart Street lobby.

Ms. Krafft did not believe it was original and that it was possibly part of a remodel because it seemed different from the rest.

Jack McCullough, representing the building owner, said they will need to look at specific parts of the lobby during the Controls and Incentives negotiation to determine what changes would go to the Board etc. They looked for the original

elevator doors and could not find them. The owner wants to eventually replace the awning; it is a problem in terms of water penetration and they plan to meet with the ARC with some possible design concepts. The owner would prefer that the later addition connecting the building the parking structure not be designated. His client endorses the designation and thought that perhaps it should be clear we are designating original building and 1925 and 1947 additions. He stated for the record he thinks the legal description includes portions of lot 9 – 12 and not all.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the Board would be dealing with the legal description.

Ms. Sodt stated they will work out the legal description before the legislation is written because the City Attorney's office will want to be sure it is exact.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee noted the lobbies are connected and act as a single lobby. The renovation work that was done in the 1990s is very sympathetic and well done and the building is beautifully maintained.

Mr. Matthews said it is an obvious candidate for designation and he agrees with the Staff Report: B, C, D and F.

Mr. Lee suggested the 1960s stairwell addition be excluded.

Ms. Sodt asked if there was a specific date for that addition.

Ms. Krafft thought it was in the 1962 when the garage was built.

Mr. McCullough asked that just the original building plus 1925 and 1947 additions be designated.

Ms. Conti supported the designation, agreeing with the Staff Recommendation and said it is a tremendous building.

Ms. Howard agreed with the Staff Recommendation and supported designation.

Ms. Strong toured the building and said the onyx in the lobby was spectacular. She supported designation but questioned if Criterion F was valid because it is distinctive because of the grid change rather than being prominent in the neighborhood.

Mr. Abelsen said it has a fascinating development history and he supported designation. He questioned how or if the Board needs to be specific about interior improvements and if so how should that be worded.

Ms. Sodt explained that having it on record was a good start and that the details could be worked out at the Controls and Incentives phase. The Board doesn't need to be

specific about the features in the lobby but it is important to acknowledge that changes have occurred over time.

Mr. Hannum supported designation based on the Staff Recommendation and said it was a wonderful building.

Mr. Veith noted the building is prominent because of its location and draws together many things at that corner. He thought it met Criterion D and said that having a building that talks about its own history is valuable. With regard to Criteria B and C it is a nexus that ties together several prominent names in the City and the Regrade. Being the first major building after the Regrade isn't obvious but it does have the affect of tying the development beyond the borders to the City as it existed before the Regrade. He supported designation agreeing with the Staff Recommendation and suggested including the interiors – the two lobbies – and trusted details of exactly what will be controlled will be discussed in Controls and Incentives. With regard to the exterior of the building he recommended excluding post 1947 additions. He said the awning was similar to one that was in Wallingford; he thought it could be dealt with in Controls and Incentives.

Mr. Lee agreed with Mr. Veith and said it is almost an historic district where every building on the corner is a landmark with the exception of the hotel. He supported designation based on Criteria B, C, D and F.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Securities Building at 1904 Third Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the staff report; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards B, C, D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building including the 1925 and 1947 additions, but excluding any other subsequent additions, and the interiors of the Third Avenue and Stewart Street lobbies.

MM/SC/MH/HM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110508.42

Seattle Labor Temple
2800 First Avenue

Ms. Sodt introduced Mimi Sheridan who would present the designation report for the City (the full report is on file).

Ms. Sheridan explained with regard to Criterion C the Seattle labor movement was a strong political and economic force for more than a century. The Labor Temple is the most significant labor building as the headquarters of the labor movement and King County Labor Council and is the symbol of the entire movement. She provided photos of other labor buildings but this one was the only labor temple. It is a specific building type: it was a center for organizing for the local labor movement that had offices for smaller unions, halls for large meetings, space for recreation, restaurant, social service agencies etc. Few of these buildings remain in active use.

Ms. Sheridan said the building meets Criterion D. Designed by McClelland and Jones in 1942 it is a simple, modern building with clean lines associated with Modernism and was built in three stages as money became available. The use of

terracotta is a rare example of post war use of terracotta; it is more notable because it is not just a tile but a strong three dimensional feature. The building meets Criterion D because of the use of details and characteristics of the period and its use of terracotta.

Board Questions:

Ms. Strong asked if the bar in the restaurant is original. Ms. Sheridan expressed doubt that it was.

Ms. Sodt explained that because the Board did not nominate anything on the interior beyond the lobby spaces, nothing more than that could be designated for the interior.

Public Comment:

Christine Palmer submitted a letter to the Board.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith stated he toured the building. He looked at the lobbies and meeting halls and wondered if they should be designated. The characteristics of those spaces are simple, straightforward and very characteristic of what he'd expect of a labor union. He agreed with the Staff Report and said the building is significant to unions in the City and this building has clear association with that movement.

Mr. Lee asked what staff thought about including the lobbies.

Ms. Sodt explained that at Nomination she did not recommend including the lobbies and she does not recommend including them now.

Mr. Hannum supported designation based on C and D and thought the post WWII use of terracotta is interesting. He agreed with Mr. Veith that the interiors are not that remarkable and should be left out.

Mr. Abelsen supported designation and said it fits all of Criterion C – cultural, political or economic because of the strength of the labor movement. The building itself is worthy of designation because as simple as it is in design, its entry way is a significant character defining feature of the building and immediate lobby is a further expression of that simpleness. He thought the building met Criterion D and Criterion F may be met by age and it's being a Modernist small scale building. He clarified he would like to see the immediate entry lobby designated.

Ms. Strong agreed the lobby should not be included and agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation based on C and D.

Ms. Howard supported designation and said it is a very significant building as the labor history is significant here and this building is the embodiment of that history. Criterion C is significant and Criterion D is met as well. She said no to the interiors.

Ms. Conti agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation. She agreed with Mr. Abelsen that the lobby does express the simpleness of the building and it carries forward as one walks through the initial entry.

Mr. Matthew supported designation and said the building was associated with the labor movement. It is a distinctive 1940s building that shows restraint and simplicity as one of its good features. He also supported designation of the first part of the lobby.

Mr. Veith stated there are two lobbies and asked other Board members which should be included.

Mr. Abelsen explained he spoke specifically of the main building entry lobby, right outside the auditorium.

Ms. Conti said both lobbies should be included.

Mr. Lee supported designation based on C and D. He likes it because it is not elaborate. The Board often designates entry areas because there is an area that defines outside/inside before one gets into the “guts” of the building.

The Board discussed which lobby space, if either should be included in designation and there was agreement both lobby spaces would be included.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Seattle Labor Temple at 2800 First Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the staff report; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C and D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building, both interior lobby spaces and the site.

MM/SC/VA/AC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110508.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

110508.51 Coca Cola Building
1313 East Columbia St.

Ms. Chave reported that the owners requested a two month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Coca Cola Building for two months.

MM/SC/TV/MH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

110508.6 BOARD BUSINESS

110508.7 STAFF REPORT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator