



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 223/08

### MINUTES

**Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40th Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, April 16, 2008– 3:30 p.m.**

#### Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen  
Mollie Tremaine  
Marie Strong  
Tom Veith  
Stephen Lee  
Czarina Nicolas  
Alyce Conti  
Henry Matthews  
Christine Howard  
Mark Hannum

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Melinda Bloom  
Karen Gordon

#### Absent

Ron Martinson  
Jerry Finrow

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

### **041608.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meeting of February 20, 2008  
MM/SC/VA/MH

10:0:0 Motion approved.

Meeting of March 5, 2008  
MM/SC/MT/MS

9:0:1 Motion approved with changes. Ms. Howard abstained.

### **041608.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION**

041608.21 Alps Hotel  
615-625 S. King St  
(International Special Review District)

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Ms. Gordon presented the staff report. She said the International Special Review District Board (ISRDB) reviewed this on April 8, 2008 and recommended approval to this Board.

Mr. Hannum asked if the cornice was completely replaced.

Ms. Gordon replied it had been.

Mr. Veith asked if the work itself had been reviewed by the ISRDB.

Ms. Gordon said it had and that this Board (LPB) receives a recommendation from the ISRDB Board that the work completed was done in compliance with a Certificate of Approval that the ISRDB issued.

**Action:** I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: The Alps Hotel, 621 South King Street. This action is based upon the criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based upon the recommendation of the International Special Review District Board which made the following findings at its meeting on April 8, 2008: that the property is a contributing building located in the International Special Review District and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance toward contribution to the International Special Review District and that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the District and has been substantially improved in the 24 months of the period prior to the application and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the Owner.

MM/SC/TV/MS

10:0:0 Motion approved.

### 041608.3

### CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

041608.31

#### Pier 55

1101 Alaskan Way

Proposed exterior alterations and signage.

**Summary of proposed changes:** Proposed storefront alterations and signage including: lowering the window sills on the storefront windows on the east elevation and modifying the entry doors in the central entry vestibule also on the east elevation; replace various existing storefront doors and windows on the north elevation and consolidating them using a new storefront system; and installation of four new signs.

Steve Swanson from Mithun said he represented the Pier 55 Shirt Company that will be consolidating four spaces into one. He said the building was recently landmarked; prior to that extensive revamps and changes have been made. He reviewed the major features of the application and said they would like to lower the windows on the front half of the Alaskan Way frontage for better visibility into the store; the windows would remain in the same location but would be lower than on the Starbucks side. He said the series of four retail shops on the north end will be consolidated into one

with a common entry that will have a wide opening. The major feature of the change is what happens in the alcove; they propose to install a horizontal sliding stacking door to open up space. He said they will not pursue canopies at this time; colors will remain the same.

Ms. Sodt advised the Board that # 1 on the materials board is not applicable as it applies to the canopies.

Mr. Lee recommended marking such on the drawings.

Mr. Matthews asked if the applicant still planned to open up the interior so the structure is visible.

Mr. Swanson said they will show as much as possible and will remove dropped ceilings to expose the wood beams and the bracing.

Mr. Matthews clarified that the large opening will make it possible to draw people in to see the structure.

Mr. Swanson said yes; because of the way the owners are doing they are doing a lot to expose the beams.

Mr. Abelsen asked for clarification on option 2 shown on the drawings.

Mr. Swanson said 2 is no longer an option. He said the CAD drawings and elevations have changed.

Ms. Sodt asked for the information to be included in the package because it gave a good idea of what was going on.

Mr. Abelsen clarified the right side of the drawing where it shows the alcove and what is happening with the door way is still applicable.

Mr. Swanson said yes.

Mr. Hannum asked if this was OK at ARC.

Mr. Lee said it was.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen was concerned about the lowering of the window but otherwise thinks it is good overall for the economic growth of the Pier.

Mr. Lee said he is not worried about dropping the windows as it keeps the same rhythm.

Mr. Abelsen agreed but wondered if the entire window assembly could be pulled down; it would make a somewhat balanced elevation.

Mr. Swanson said the windows on the north side are different heights than they are on Alaskan Way side.

Mr. Veith said at ARC he had reservations about the north elevation because the new entry is going to a different kind of system from the system everywhere else and he would have like to see a consistent system; he talked himself into approving on the basis that the north elevation had already been modified several times and not in a consistent manner so maybe he could live with one more inconsistency. He said he doesn't see the lowering the sills is gaining much at the front but he is OK with it as it is at least following the system.

Ms. Howard thought it was fine; she said she would prefer window not being lowered but it is not a deal breaker.

Ms. Conti said she was fine with it.

**Action:** I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations and business signage.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report 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

10:0:0 Motion approved.

041608.32

Hiawatha Playfield

2700 California Ave SW

Proposed site alterations including installation of synthetic turf, fencing, lighting; tree removal and tree planting

Lynn Sullivan, Seattle Parks Department presented the alterations to the Hiawatha Playfield. She said the field was constructed in 1908 when the Olmsted Brothers put a plan before the Parks Board which was approved; it asked that the City of Seattle build parks that were associated with schools so the school teachers could supervise the children as they played. Hiawatha Field was built across from Lafayette Grade School; five years later the high school was constructed. When built, it included a baseball field and a track. Over the course of years, the track has been moved to around the field, a soccer field was added; at one point it included a football field which has been removed.

Ms. Sullivan said currently Friends of Olmsted and multiple sports activities all vie for space on the field: football, track, baseball, and soccer. Ms. Sullivan said all groups have agreed on the plan which she is presenting today. Concessions made by the group: the football field will not be fully gridded, the backing will be there as will the 10-yard lines, but not the hatch marks or numbers; the soccer field will be narrow,

187 feet wide as opposed 195 feet wide; baseball foul lines will not be as deep; the track will not be an official track with six lanes but will have three lanes; Friends of Olmsted agreed to this as they are happy as long as the track has symmetry and has trees to overlap the track. The track will also be available to pedestrians.

Eric Gold presented the design and said the direction from the ARC and Parks was to use the original Olmsted plan as basic inspiration for proposal. They worked closely with sports interests and Friends of Olmsted Parks to fit competing geometries as well as the constraints of the topography and existing mature tree canopy in the park in a way to find reconciliation between all interests. The tree preservation requirements for the work necessitated defining the critical root zones for all the trees to come up with bilaterally symmetrical form that would fit around all the athletic field shapes and be outside critical root zones. They have designed the footprint of the project so the limit of disturbance is 95% within the outside footprint of the existing track and to bring the existing pedestrian circulation around the track facility.

Mr. Gold stated the materials consist of standardized materials for the Parks Department: concrete paving around and behind the backstop; asphalt paving and continuation of asphalt paths where they meet the rubberized surfacing; stabilized crushed rock paths where they exist extending into new rubberized surfacing; synthetic turf and rubberized material. The rubberized material is new for the Parks Department, it is currently installed only in a couple other Parks locations. The synthetic turf has been used at other Parks locations, Bobby Morris Park for example. Similar to Bobby Morris they propose a black vinyl coated chain link fence; a standard upright, geometrically simple backstop as opposed to other more complex designs. It is 30 feet high around homeplate and then steps down to 20 feet high as ends at the base pads at the infield; on one side it goes away completely as one moves into the permanent markings for football and soccer field. It extends to become a batting cage which is replacement of existing feature.

Mr. Gold said the dugout roofs currently are powder coated galvanized steel in light blue are proposed to be replaced with dark green or black color. The turf color is as per the sample provided to the Board. The infield fan will be tan; soccer field striping will be yellow; the football striping will be white as will be the baseball.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith said the contract drawings show the full hatching and numbering of the football field.

Mr. Gold said it has been removed from the drawings as of today, but the submitted drawings don't depict it correctly.

Ms. Chave requested a revised drawing.

Mr. Gold agreed to provide updated drawing.

Mr. Hannum asked which elm tree would be removed.

Mr. Gold showed on the drawing.

Ms. Sullivan added that the tree is broken and misshapen due to storm damage.

Mr. Gold said the trees shown in light green on the plan are the new ones; the plan illustrates the 10-year vision for the new trees.

Ms. Chave advised the Board packet contains a tree plan.

Mr. Veith said it is a pretty dense set of drawings.

Mr. Gold guided the Board to sheet F.1.0, Planting Plan.

Ms. Sullivan said that all parties at the planning table were in agreement that the elm needed to be removed.

Ms. Chave said all the different options were brought to the Architectural Review Committee in the early stages of design.

Mr. Gold stated they had a separate working process with the Friends of Olmsted Parks selecting the species that are being used for replacement and also reviewing with them the placement of those trees. A number of the existing trees on the site were planted as part of a 1995 Certificate of Approval will be moved to other locations on the site and/or replaced. They have 20 new trees, six existing trees to be transplanted on site; two existing trees being transplanted to other parks in the neighborhood; the elm tree is the only significant tree being removed, there are a couple less significant trees that are also in bad shape that will be removed.

Mr. Lee said the type of turf specified needs a flat uniform site. He asked how they intend to rectify where the grade is higher on the California side.

Mr. Gold said there is a transition area. He said there is a 12-1 maximum slope in any transitioning which does occur in one area which he showed on the plan.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the turf life expectancy.

Mr. Gold said the service life of the synthetic turf is not expected to be beyond eight years; all the base and infrastructure has a thirty year life expectancy. The expectation is the aggregate base can be removed and replaced; the storm drainage infrastructure they are putting in should be indefinite, fifty years is reasonable.

Ms. Tremaine asked if the football lines would be permanent.

Mr. Gold said the lines will be permanent. The football grid will be inlaid into the synthetic turf. They propose minimum marking that the JV football program can get by with. He guided the Board to the electrical drawings and said the light pole locations have to correspond to the specific yard lines.

Mr. Veith asked where the limit of the chain link fence will be.

Mr. Gold located on the drawing the extent of the black vinyl covered chain link fencing. He said it is about a 50% reduction in chain link fence just at the baseball

facility plus they are completely eliminating the softball field backstop. Sight lines through the park will be improved.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Tremaine said she walks by the tree all the time and she confirms that it is broken and battered.

Mr. Lee said having seen the photographs of what is there now it will be an improvement.

Mr. Veith appreciated the consensus decision about difficult project; it makes it a lot more comfortable in his Board role to say it is an acceptable revision of the property.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site alterations including installation of synthetic turf, fencing, lighting; tree removal and tree planting. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 113090 as the proposed project does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, with the exception of one elm tree, and 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*. .

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/MT/VA 10:00 Motion approved.

041608.33 Fauntleroy Church, UCC/YMCA  
9260 California Ave SW  
Proposed window replacement

Deferred to next meeting at the request of the applicant.

**041608.4 NOMINATIONS**

041608.41 Chief Sealth High School  
2600 SW Thistle St.

Lorne McConachie, Bassetti Architects presented the nomination on behalf of the Seattle School District. He said that the District does not believe the school should be nominated. He said that Bassetti is the project architect for the co-location of Chief Sealth High School and Denny Middle School. He provided context of the location of the school in the Westwood Neighborhood in West Seattle. The building was completed in 1958; it is a modern building variously referred to mid-century modernism, post war modernism, modernism. The architects were NBBJ. Floyd Naramore was one of the school architects for the City of Seattle; at this time he was

part of the NBBJ firm. The campus is 17.4 acres with its main entrance off SW Thistle.

Mr. McConachie said the campus comprises a long linear building, main mass of building and then gymnasium. Chief Sealth shares the athletic field with Denny Middle School. The property is bounded on the north by SW Kenyon, west side is 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW and Longfellow Creek. The residential character around is primarily single family that was developed in the 1940s and 1950s to the west and north, multi family primarily to the east and somewhat south, with Westwood Village shopping center is just south. Denny Middle School is somewhat co-located at the site.

Freddie Dickinson, Bassetti Architects, presented the physical details of the building; he said it is cast concrete, post and beam with thin shell concrete roof shape. There are three main pieces: the main classroom wing that includes the main auditorium at the south; the gym; and seven portables on the west site. The thin shell roof type is in a concave shape, the roof to the library is newer construction. The same roof shape is repeated for the length of a football field. There are several types of window: the ribbon window goes around the façade on the full west side and east side. There are several types of open windows. The site sits on a slope: on the west side is one floor; on the east side there is another floor tucked under where there are glass block transom windows. There is glass block in the gym; clerestory in the library; new entry added that has its own glass characteristics.

Mr. Dickinson said the auditorium with its billboard façade is constructed of precast concrete panels; entry way with cantilever, painted brick. The gym also is precast concrete with similar approach and entry; it is large in scale and straight up with not much reveal. The west side is single story with a long elevation; the sunshades march down ribbon windows. The west façade of the gym is double story and similar all around, precast concrete, glass block ribbon. The east side is two stories with just classrooms on the bottom; the ribbon windows on the second floor run the same elevation they do on the west. On the east side bottom floor there are a set of ribbon windows but also transom glass block. On the north façade, it has been replaced. The sunshades are similar. The covered walkway runs the full length of the east side of the building. The north side provides clear visual of the sloping site; the upper floor of the main building hugs over the edge of the slope and makes room for the bottom floor classrooms.

Mr. Dickinson showed a couple minor entries on the north side that go directly into the border of the classrooms. He said the canopy connects the gym to the canopy that runs alongside the high school. He said the “cone of knowledge” entry was constructed in 2004 of concrete with brick veneer; with a different window system introduced.

Mr. Dickinson showed the layout with the auditorium at the south end; two double loaded corridors running in parallel with three corridors. At one time there were four courtyards; one was renovated to become the library. The gym is a separate building comprised of a main gym and a couple smaller ones; a weight room, some locker rooms and mechanical systems. The interior is heavily defined by vaulted roof. Daylighting in the building comes in many forms: the glass block transom on the east façade, courtyard “light wells”; clerestory in Library.

Mr. McConachie said the building is over 25 years old. He said while the building meets the age criteria for landmark status but the question is does it have significant character, interest or value as part of the development of the area of the City. He said there were roughly 25 schools built between 1945 and 1960 and asked if this was an outstanding example. It took a lot of its cues from factory construction; it is very repetitious, neutral in its presence. He said they believe the building has reasonable integrity, some of the changes including the “cone of knowledge”, the enclosure of one of the courtyards and the inverted roof form of the Library; a lot of the painted brick was originally exposed brick but has been painted over. He said most of the alterations are reversible.

Mr. McConachie said they have not found any association with historic event and although it is named for Chief Sealth they have found nothing significant about Chief Sealth at this location. The most famous graduate of this high school is Art Wolfe the wildlife photographer but the high school is not associated in any way with his photography. He said with regard to cultural, political, economic heritage this is one of many post war Seattle schools and have found nothing significant.

With regard to Criterion D Mr. McConachie said the thin shelled concrete structure was design by NBBJ with Jack Christenson the structural engineer. Thin shelled concrete was a very popular methodology of construction in the 1950s and 1960s; it was economical because labor rates were low and it had potential for seismic resistance though it wouldn't meet criteria today. It is an interesting method of construction but does it rise to a level of significance. He showed photos of examples of thin shelled concrete construction: Saarinen's JFK Airport, the Kresge Auditorium at MIT which have a singular form and powerful way concrete is used as a sculptural form. He contrasted these with Chief Sealth which is repetitious to the point of being boring. He also provided of thin shelled concrete structures in Seattle which were repetitious forms not rising to Saarinen's work.

Mr. McConachie referred to Criterion E, they contact NBBJ who was not forthcoming about this building as a point of major pride; they have had other buildings that are pretty significant. Jack Christensen, as a structural engineer, did important buildings and was expert in thin shelled concrete; he worked on the Kingdome, the Pacific Science Center and the Jackson Federal Building. Examples of NBBJ's work at the time included the Bloodbank, 1948; the Veteran's Hospital, 1951. The Kingdome was probably one of Jack Christensen's most important buildings and a seminal thin shelled concrete work as was Pacific Science Center which really pushed the edges of what thin shelled concrete could do. He said that almost every school has prominence and special ness in its neighborhood and location but not every school is a landmark and does this school rise to that sense of prominence and eminence in the Westwood neighborhood.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith said he was surprised at the evenness of the pictures in terms of the lighting which is a difficult thing to get which speaks to the good design with regard to lighting; that is an important characteristic for school architecture. He said there were some nice looking interiors, particularly the interior around the administration offices, he wondered if they were more recent and if the cove lighting was a more recent addition.

Mr. McConachie said yes; that was done in 2004, simultaneous to the entry “cone” there were many improvements; it is a maple slat ceiling, cove lighting trying to play up the cove repetition of the big school and use it in more than mundane manner. The glue on acoustical tile is in pretty sad shape after 50 years. The daylighting of the school is probably its best attribute; unfortunately the major facades face east and west which is a challenge in terms of controlling the daylight but Mr. Veith’s observation about the photographs is correct, it is a well-daylit school.

Mr. Matthews asked if there are other schools that were built with the thin shelled system.

Mr. McConachie said Ingraham High School has thin shelled concrete as part of its auditorium though he has not researched it.

Mr. Matthews asked among Seattle schools of this time if the method of construction and design is unique.

Mr. McConachie thought it was.

Mr. Matthews asked if Christensen did the S. Lake Union building.

Mr. Lee thought Christensen was the engineer on the Wholesale Florist.

Ms. Howard asked what the original entry was like before the “cone of knowledge” was constructed.

Mr. McConachie thought it was understated; he showed on the plan a covered canopy that moves into the corridor that runs all the way through the school; it was just a negative recess. He said the cone became a marker.

Mr. Veith asked if the scheme ever had the look of the rendering where it looked like what is now the parking lot was recessed and an elevated drive came up to the entry. If it had been built that way it would have been a quite striking and obvious entry.

Mr. McConachie said Thistle slopes steeply from West to East with the entry to the parking lot at a lower level; the exit is 10-12 feet higher. There is another eight feet to the door; it is a fairly active topography.

Ms. Conti asked if he had a photo of the Kimball Art Museum.

Mr. McConachie said the Kimball has much more clarity in terms of each volume standing alone and adjacent barrel vault. They slipped the vaults much more effectively. There are some similarities but wouldn’t relate the two other than they have repetitious barrel vaults.

Ms. Conti asked how long the academic assistance has been going on for the Latino community.

Someone from the public: said five to ten years.

Ms. Howard asked who was the architect for the 1969 renovation.

Mr. McConachie responded it was NBBJ.

Mr. Veith asked if the Library was a completely new space.

Mr. McConachie confirmed it was and said it was the enclosure of one of the courtyards; the Library is one of the nicer spaces in the school.

Mr. Veith asked if the auditorium was remodeled.

Mr. McConachie replied that it is in tough shape and doesn't think it had ever been remodeled; it is possible there could have been a minor remodel but he didn't notice the auditorium being part of that. Without going into detail, he said there are major issues in the auditorium.

Mr. Veith said there was a thinking in the 1950s which actually used the model of factory not only for the building but for the educational system; that was part of the zeitgeist of the time. This building would seem an exceptionally clear statement of that; he wondered if that would bend his thinking in anyway on Criterion C or D.

Mr. McConachie said it was a good question but with regard to C, he asked if that was the standard of the day it would be hard to say it was of double significance. This wasn't the first, it was one of thousands across the country. He has not read anything about the factory concept that said "let's start it at Chief Sealth". Regarding Criterion D, this is certainly a visible characteristic but the challenge is, with thousands of schools being built, is this the embodiment of that; it was the standard of the day.

#### Public Comment:

Chris Jackins, Coordinator, Seattle Committee to Save Schools read from a letter; there were six points. He spoke in support of nomination: 1) the architects were well known, both generally and for designing other Seattle Public Schools; 2) the site is prominent, 17.4 acres which dominates the area; 3) the layout is striking; 4) the thin-shell reinforced concrete construction is distinctive; 5) the use of natural lighting, including grids of opaque glass block is distinctive; 6) noted wildlife photographer is a Sealth alumnus. (*Complete letter is in the file*).

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews said he supports the nomination. He said this represents a phase of the modern movement; it is a rare example of thin shell construction. It doesn't make sense to compare it to Saarinen's work or the more flamboyant structures of that time. This was a time when a lot of school authorities were thinking about rationalizing the school construction so it be economical; this is unusual solution. "Factory" is kind of loaded; it is an issue of taking a new structural concept and employing it in a school building for economic construction. He supports based on D.

Ms. Conti said she supports the nomination based on D; it is a good example the modern style of architecture and a good representation of thin shell concrete. She said she likes the barrel arch roof vault and how it goes on ad infinitum; it is unique.

Mr. Abelsen said in review of this project and in light of what he has heard, the only Criterion worth discussing is Criterion D; there are threads of possibility in the others but the main significance is the building itself. He said he would lean more toward Mr. Matthew's explanation of the rational design as opposed to the factory design but more reading on that would help clarify it. He doesn't think it is one of NBBJ's best works. He believes the rhythm is evident of the quality of what can be done with the repeat of barrel vaults. He is not certain that it is a strong enough element for nomination. The fact that it is thin shell concrete is good but he doesn't know that it is the best representation of that in the City of Seattle. It is significant that the architect and the structural engineer were of great significance but those two entities produced much greater, more significant work. He said in one sense, if just the east façade could be nominated he thinks that would carry him forward but as is, he can't support the nomination.

Ms. Howard agreed with Mr. Abelsen that the relevant Criterion is D. She visited the site and was struck by how well the building works at different levels of the site, the repetition of the themes and how they are carried out in both interior and exterior spaces. The daylighting is striking; the interior courtyards are a huge element that she didn't expect, especially combined with the wide hallways and the barrel vaulting. That said she has significant concerns about the 2004 alterations which are nice but they do affect the sense of the building as a modernist building. She would be willing to support nomination but she does have some concerns and at this point she would think more about how those changes affect it.

Ms. Nicolas thinks it meets the threshold and it has clean lines and it very bright. She enjoys the repetition of curves in the design. She said if we are nominating this building along with the gym and the new additions she has reservations about the nomination. The east façade is enjoyable and landmark worthy but the other additions don't really match. She does not support nomination.

Ms. Tremaine does not support nomination. She said when compared to other schools that been reviewed the past year it doesn't haven't have historic fabric that a major school needs to have. The barrel vaults are overdone, repetitious and boring; if she were to nominate something with thin shell concrete she would be more inclined to nominate more artistic towers at the Seattle Center that Christensen designed as they are quite special.

Ms. Strong said in reviewing the exhibits for this application she noticed the lighting. The only standard that would apply is D but based on other examples presented this doesn't rise to the standard of landmark so she does not support the nomination.

Mr. Veith agreed that D is the primary area of consideration; it is a borderline example. He said over his time on the Board perhaps he has been too kind to borderline examples. It is exemplary of an approach to a school and of an approach to a lot of public buildings in this area; he took Mr. Matthews point that it is the rationalizing of the design and the architecture more than factory mimic. It suffers from the same problem that a lot of buildings from this era do, which is, the designers became so focused on the economy of the building that they forgot to examine some of the architectural opportunities. He wouldn't be opposed to nominating it but didn't think he would designate it so will likely vote no.

Mr. Hannum agreed with other Board members that D is the Criterion to consider but will vote not to support the nomination. Like some of the older buildings the Board has looked at, it is interesting, it has features that give it a quality that is emblematic of the period but is not innovative or outstanding nor does it have outstanding features that makes it a landmark.

Mr. Lee said he agreed somewhat with Mr. Matthews but he has concern about consistency; in looking at the Wholesale Building done by the same engineer, which was a cleaner example and was not nominated. He said this building doesn't rise to the significance of a landmark. He used to live in the neighborhood and doesn't recall seeing the building.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff does not recommend the nomination of the Chief Sealth High School at 2600 SW Thistle St. based on the following designation standards of SMC 25.12:

- A. Chief Sealth High School is not the location of, nor is it associated in a significant way with, an historic event with a significant effect upon the community, city, state or nation;
- B. Chief Sealth High School is not associated in a significant way with the life of a person important in the history of the city, state or nation;
- C. This designation standard requires that a property to be associated in a significant way with a significant aspect of the cultural, political or economic heritage of the city, state or nation. There is no information provided that indicates this building meets the double significance requirement of this standard.
- D. This standard requires that a building embody the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, period or method of construction. Although Chief Sealth High School was built in a design vocabulary very common to its era, it does not embody distinctive visible characteristics of its style, especially in comparison with other buildings of this era.
- E. Chief Sealth High School is not an outstanding work of NBBJ, the architects of the building.
- F. Chief Sealth High School is not an easily identifiable feature of its neighborhood or the City and does not contribute to the distinctive quality or identity of its neighborhood or the City.

**Action:** I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Chief Sealth High School at 2600 SW Thistle St. as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the Staff Report.

**MM/SC/MS/MH**

7:3:0 Motion approved. Mr. Matthews, Ms. Conti, Ms. Howard opposed.

041608.42

Denny Middle School  
8402 30<sup>th</sup> Ave SW

Mr. McConachie said Denny Middle School was constructed in 1952; it faces onto 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW and is part of the Westwood neighborhood. It is modernist in its character. The architects were Mallis and Hart. The site is bounded by SW Thistle which runs in front of Chief Sealth, SW Cloverdale is on the north. Denny terraces down its site in three distinct bands; there is roughly a 30 foot elevation change from west to east dropping down the hill toward Longfellow Creek. The landscaping character of this six acre site is fairly minimal.

Mr. Dickinson provided architectural detail of the building which is a brick veneer concrete structure. It is a campus with five pieces to it: two classroom bars on their own levels, each with a piece on the end, the cafeteria, music room. On the east side are the arts and gymnasium wings. There are several different roof shapes on the campus: flat roofs, sawtooth roofs over arts and gymnasium wing, shed roofs, and butterfly; the finish is asphalt shingle. He said there are many different fenestration types: ribbon windows, clerestory, punched vertical, glass block, and fixed.

Mr. Dickinson stated the material palette is mostly brick and painted concrete; there is a lot of glass block, steel and wood in interiors but mostly brick around the edges. The buildings are different heights in proportion to each other; all similar concrete structure with the way the walkways punch into the buildings or wrap around. The entire campus is single story. There are some planted areas between buildings but the slope is pretty steep so is not really usable as a standing area. He said the interior of the space has double loaded corridors running north – south through the wings which are connected through exterior covered walkways. Interior finishes include acoustical tiles, vinyl floors, metal wood framed doors. The daylighting has nice variations: large panels of glass block provides nice light into the music rooms, there are transoms over the entry, and clerestories in some of the classrooms.

Mr. McConachie said Denny is one of 25 schools built between 1945 and 1960. He doesn't think this is outstanding. The building has integrity; it has not been changed and is fairly coherent. It is an old school but is in decent shape. They have not found any association with an historic event so it would not meet Criterion A. In terms of significant person, it is named for pioneer David T. Denny but there was no direct association. It does not meet Criterion

C. Criterion D is the most thought-worthy; while there are some characteristics of mid-century modernism, he would challenge this building in terms of its coherence. The massing is jumbled, the fenestration has everything from ribbon, punched, vertical, sawtooth; it is a complex composition and he is not sure that it rises to the Bauhaus quality that it was trying to adhere to. He provided examples: Crown Hall at ITT, Thierry's Northeast Library, Belluschi's church in Portland.

With regard to Criterion E, Mr. McConachie said Mallis was the primary designer; he teamed up with several different architects and this happened to be at a time when he was associated with Hart. Other buildings by Mallis that are notable are Nathan Eckstein Middle School, Aki Kurose and Jane Addams High School have a greater clarity. A school in its neighborhood is a question that needs to be thought about in regards to Criterion F, prominence. This is a low slung school stepping down the hill; it tucks into the hillside and is fairly small compared to Chief Sealth and nearby apartment buildings. The School District does not support nomination.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked the relevance of the California plan to this site.

Mr. McConachie said he would interpret that as being a combination of interior/exterior walkways; that was fairly new in terms of some of the mid-century modernism that was coming into the Northwest. Kids go outside between buildings between classes; extreme examples are every class opens to the outside. It is referring to the notion of a single story structure spread out on a site with exterior circulation.

Mr. Abelsen asked if there are other examples in the City.

Mr. McConachie responded there are many; many of the mid-century Modernist buildings of this era are exterior circulation campuses. In some areas it is still being done today.

Public Comment:

Chris Jackins, Coordinator, Seattle Committee to Save Schools read from a letter; he supports nomination. He presented four points: 1) the architects designed a number of other Seattle schools; 2) the site is clearly prominent in the neighborhood; 3) the use of natural lighting including "window walls" and grids of opaque glass block is striking; and 4) Denny is a "community" school. He stated there is currently a lawsuit against the co-location of the schools. *Complete letter in file.*

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum stated he was more enthused about this school than Sealth. He said D would be the Criterion but he doesn't know that he can support the nomination. He was interested to see that the Sharples School was by the same architect; he thought that a better example of the architect's work and the style. The coherence of Denny seems to be a jumble but he is more enthused about this school (than Sealth). He is leaning toward "no" but could be persuaded.

Mr. Veith thought Sealth was a clearer candidate; this one is a jumble. The concept of the school seems to be trying to do too many things at once; it is a jumble of materials and a jumble of approaches to lighting. The presenters comments about the coherence of this school; coherence is missing. He liked the building as seen in the last slide. It is farther from the standard than Sealth was and he won't support nomination.

Ms. Strong doesn't support nomination; looking through the photos she saw several architectural elements that are lovely; the high ceilings and the light probably creates a good experience for the student but don't support nomination. The only relevant criterion is D; she is in question about it but will vote "no".

Ms. Tremaine stated the building has integrity as the building is pretty much as it was but it doesn't have significance. The 1950s buildings are difficult because so many look like they were built in hurry with inexpensive materials. She looks for a building that speaks to her; this building doesn't do that. She will vote "no".

Ms. Nicolas doesn't support nomination; in contrast to Sealth this building is just a box.

Ms. Howard said it was unfortunate that she visited Sealth High School before visiting Denny because Sealth has the appearance and the clarity. There were nice individual features but the clarity and coherence were lacking. She will vote "no".

Mr. Abelsen doesn't support the nomination, primarily because of its lack of coherence and design elements. He appreciated Mr. Jackins coming forward in support of nomination because he is a community voice that he would like to hear more of.

Ms. Conti said she cannot support nomination because this building lacks the significance of the architect's other designs.

Mr. Matthews shared some of Mr. Jackins enthusiasm for the simple assembly

spaces with their daylighting though he is convinced by Mr. McConachie's argument that it does not meet the criteria so he does not support nomination.

Mr. Lee said the Sealth building was a clear and good example of modern design. It is a characteristic of this era that compensated for the lack of money; it would have to be a distinct design and this one doesn't have it. He will vote "no".

Staff does not recommend the nomination of the Denny Middle School at 8402 30<sup>th</sup> Ave SW based on the following designation standards of SMC 25.12:

- A. Denny Middle School is not the location of, nor is it associated in a significant way with, an historic event with a significant effect upon the community, city, state or nation;
- B. Denny Middle School is not associated in a significant way with the life of a person important in the history of the city, state or nation;
- C. This designation standard requires that a property to be associated in a significant way with a significant aspect of the cultural, political or economic heritage of the city, state or nation. There is no information provided that indicates this building meets the double significance requirement of this standard.
- D. This standard requires that a building embody the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, period or method of construction. Although Denny Middle School was built in a design vocabulary very common to its era, it does not embody distinctive visible characteristics of its style, especially in comparison with other buildings of this era.
- E. Denny Middle School is not an outstanding work of Mallis and DeHart, the architects of the building.
- F. Denny Middle School is not an easily identifiable feature of its neighborhood or the City and does not contribute to the distinctive quality or identity of its neighborhood or the City.

**Action:** "I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Denny Middle School at 8402 30<sup>th</sup> Ave SW as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the Staff Report."

**MM/SC/MH/CH**

10:0:0 Motion approved.

041608.43

Seattle Japanese Garden  
1075 Lake Washington Blvd. E.

Andy Sheffer, Seattle Parks, said the Parks Department is very excited about the potential nomination of the Japanese Garden and enthusiastically supports the nomination; it is one of the jewels of the Parks system. He introduced preservation consultant Cathy Wickwire who prepared the nomination and will present it. He said Parks staff are grateful for all her work.

Ms. Wickwire said the nomination is very detailed so she will provide an overview. The Japanese Garden is at the southern end of the Washington Park Arboretum. Adjacent neighborhoods are Madison Park, Madison Valley, Capital Hill and Montlake. The topography is such that it is a long, narrow valley; the Japanese Garden sits at the southern end of the valley. There is a slope to the valley and the Japanese Garden tucks into a hollow.

Ms. Wickwire provided historical photos and maps of the area; an 1874 photo showed the area before the Montlake cut where there was originally a railroad portage. An 1894 photo of Foster Island showed was much smaller because Lake Washington was nine feet higher than present. There was some development at this time around Madison Park and on Capital Hill; there were some roads through this area but there wasn't a lot of development. Judge McGilvra owned a large chunk of land, and the Puget Mill Company owned a nearby chunk of land that is now the Broadmoor Golf Course and also the land that is at the northern end of the Arboretum.

Ms. Wickwire stated after the acquisition of the first parcel of land in 1900 from the Puget Mill Company, there was an adjoining subdivision they were putting in that they wanted water main improvements extended to. In 1907 a lot of development, especially of Capital Hill, but there is still a large chunk of undeveloped land. Even though in 1904 they began improving Washington Lake Blvd. not much was done with the property. In 1909 the area was integrated within the larger park system but there still wasn't much happening there but there was the playfield at the southern end. The playfield was developed after the ravine was filled in with garbage in a sanitary landfill in order to create level ground to have a playfield. The shelter house was built in 1930.

Ms. Wickwire said in 1924 the City's Board of Parks Commissioners entered into an agreement with the University of Washington to turn over what was Washington Park, including the playfield, for use as an arboretum and botanical garden; nothing really happened for another ten years when in the 1930s they came up with a lease agreement between the University to operate it as a botanical garden and arboretum and the City of Seattle Board of Parks Commissioners. Although there were financial difficulties at the time, there was a lot of free labor; this became part of one of the larger works progress administration projects. In 1936 money was raised by the Seattle Garden Club for the Olmsted Brothers to produce a plan, which was completed in early 1936. The plan was used from 1935 to 1941 to develop the site as the arboretum.

Ms. Wickwire said a lot of what was on the plan never did get built. Extensive lagoons were planned, as were large horticulture buildings and administrative

buildings; at the southern where the playfield had been they had planned a very extensive rose garden. A 1950 brochure for the arboretum shows what was actually built that laid down the foundations for what is now the arboretum. This area is where the maples section was put in. It has a sequence of botanical families that are laid out in a series and following a specific format for doing that. Part of the reason this area was chosen when they decided to put in the Japanese Garden was it already had a water feature and it already had maples. She said a prospectus was put together by Mrs. Neil Hague to sell the Japanese Government on the idea of supporting the plan to try to get funding; they were actually the ones who came up with the plan and donated the tea house. The major funding for constructing the tea house came from Prentice Bloedel though at the time his donation was anonymous. The stone bridge was built by the works progress administration; there is one at the southern end of the arboretum and there was also one closer to the northern end. Many of the trees, the bridge and the pond were included in the design for the new garden. The groundbreaking for the tea house was in 1959; the tea house itself was donated by the City of Tokyo. It was assembled at a trade fair in Japan and then reassembled here on this site. The plans for the Japanese Garden were done by Japanese Master Gardener Kyoshi Inoshita with input from others.

Ms. Wickwire said one of the major features that was not executed was the clubhouse at the southern end. In Japan it isn't a "Japanese Garden" it is just a garden and is usually associated with a structure; there is a building that you are either sitting in looking out to the garden, or it is a building that is within the garden and you are seeing it from different viewpoints. Juki Ida executed the design and actually pointed out the details of what went where; he is credited with creating the garden but there were many Japanese Americans who did the labor and that has not been as prominent; she tried to show within the nomination the real connection to the local Japanese American landscapers who did all the work initially and then over the years maintained it. For Japanese landscapers, this was a departure from their usual work; they weren't creating authentic Japanese Gardens, they were doing landscaping work. There are articles about how this was something new for them; they did it quite well.

Ms. Wickwire showed a Victor Steinbrueck sketch of the tea house in the Japanese Garden; it gives a sense of how open it was before all the plants matured. Despite current traffic just outside the park, inside there is a sense of peace and tranquility. Originally the garden was entered through what was known as the emperor's gate on the northeast corner of the garden; the intent was one would come in, the bridge was right in front, views to the right and left. What didn't work well for this entrance location was the lack of parking. The rolling gate was installed in 1987 to provide additional security. The south gate, which is currently used, was installed in 1961 in recognition of the need for nearby parking. Much of the plaza was installed in 1987; the ticket booth was from Seattle Center and was repurposed and there is a message board. At the entrance to the garden is the shedding stone which is where one pauses because of moving from outside world into the peace and tranquility of the garden.

Ms. Wickwire said the Asumaya wading arbor was not completed. The tea garden is another example of an area where you do not get one view of the whole thing; you get smaller glimpses as you are moving through. In the tea ceremony, you come into the garden and wait in the Machiai for the tea ceremony to start. Within the Machiai there is a covered seating area; it is a time to be contemplative before you enter the garden. The pathways between the Machiai and the back of the tea house

has stepping stones that are meant to make you pause and think and sometimes look up around; you have to walk on the stepping stones because the moss that is covering the ground is quite delicate. The original tea house was destroyed in an arson fire in 1973; it was reconstructed using the original plans and was rededicated in 1981. It is used for tea ceremonies.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen said it is a marvelous site. With regard to the gravel paths that were put in for accessibility, he asked how do the floor areas fit into design?

Ms. Wickwire said a number of ADA improvements were implemented in 1977 to make it more accessible; it enables people in wheelchairs to travel into certain areas. The one path that is all along the west side was originally a service road that was converted to a wide path for this purpose. They have tried to integrate a bit but for a time there was a struggle to retain the character. What is more jarring for a lot of gardeners is the restraining ropes to keep people from walking off the path. She said there were some concessions originally; in terms of the design originally the plan was just to have a hedge around it. Even before it was open people broke in and vandalized the tea house; the effort to keep vandals out was constant. Originally there was a chain link fence around the entire site; later the cedar fence was put up. Normally you would see into the garden where this is now walled off but is done so for its own protection.

Ms. Tremaine asked if perhaps that whole area had been wetlands.

Ms. Wickwire replied a creek had gone through the area and the pond was create by the WPA. A lot of spring water came down the hillside; the pond used to be fed by the spring water but because there was some contamination it had to be diverted elsewhere. More of the wetlands were further north, closer to Lake Washington.

Ms. Tremaine asked if perhaps today it might not have been built.

Ms. Wickwire stated in 1957 they came up with the idea and it was done in 1960, there wasn't really the kind of public input that there is today; that is more the reason it might not happen today.

Ms. Chave asked about the applicability of Criterion E, whether it is a significant work of a designer or builder and thought about the different people who worked on the garden. She advised the Board to think about that too, about not just acknowledging the designer but to acknowledge there were other workers. She said it is really an outstanding collective work of designers and builders; she was thinking about how to craft language to address that.

Mr. Abelsen asked about Criteria A and B, those must be applicable but it is not really stated.

Ms. Wickwire said she wouldn't say there was any event or person that was specifically tied to this although she was impressed with Mrs. Hague who got everyone organized. Mrs. Hague was involved with the arboretum foundation and also had extensive history with the Sierra Club; she was interested in the outdoors

and was on one of the arboretum committees and was made Chair of the Special Projects Committee by Carl Ballard. She believes the relevant Criterion for nomination is C in terms of the different layers of history but also the association with Japanese Americans. There is the whole history and paradox, of this fascination with all things Japanese from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century into the 20<sup>th</sup> century yet being at the same discriminatory at the same time; you see that manifested in the garden. In World War II with the incarceration of the Japanese Americans and see that even in the camps they were building gardens to continue to express themselves. After the war within a short amount of time, it again became all the rage, part of it with the ranch style home architecture and spare modernism, the Japanese aesthetic worked well. In Seattle the Seattle Japanese Gardeners Association was really unheralded in this. Kyoshi Inoshita, the original concept designer; Juki Ida, a prominent designer who was very well known in Japan, this would stand as one of his great works; and then the three designers/craftsmen who executed the work.

Mr. Lee asked if the Japanese community knew about the landmark nomination.

Mr. Sheffer said they are involved; the information about the nomination is on the website. The tea ceremony brings in a lot of cultural elements to the garden.

Ms. Wickwire thought it might be an outgrowth of that sister city association; in some ways “letting bygones be bygones”. This was one of the first Japanese Gardens built.

Ms. Chave asked if there was an international society of Japanese Gardens.

Ms. Wickwire said there are a number of website that deals with Japanese Gardens, this was in the top ten in the country.

Mr. Sheffer said the maintenance of the garden is the key to its success. He said they work with a consultant from Portland, Masa; they don't do any pruning themselves, they don't move a single plant without consulting Masa. Masa does all the pruning once a year at the proper time; he'll instruct the park gardeners exactly what to do and will mark everything.

Ms. Wickwire said these were second generation Japanese Americans who worked on the garden; they primarily did it because it was an avenue to have successful business because many other avenues were closed to them. As an indication of how successful they were, very few of their children are continuing on in that tradition. The Seattle Japanese Gardener Association was disbanded a few years back as members have aged and died.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee stated it was an obvious landmark.

Mr. Hannum said it meets several Criteria and is a landmark.

Mr. Matthews agrees with the staff report on Criteria C, D, E and F; it is so obvious that it should be landmarked.

Ms. Conti said it is fabulous and she agrees with the staff report on all counts.

Mr. Veith said this is another one of those sites where you wonder why it hasn't been designated already.

Mr. Abelsen the terms significant, distinctive and outstanding are overflowing here; it is a no-brainer. He suggests to the Board in the Staff Recommendation what they would be nominating. He is not sure he would agree with the structures at the south entry, nor would he agree with the security gate at the northeast.

Ms. Chave said the reason those were included at this stage if because it will be looked at and pared down more at the designation and then pare down more for the Controls and Incentives agreements. It wasn't because she thought they have significance.

Mr. Lee said these are people who obviously care about it but what will happen in twenty or thirty years time; it is good there is some sort of check on the context of this place. He agrees to go more globally and then pare down.

Ms. Strong supports the nomination based on C, D, E, and F as in the Staff Report and complimented the applicant on a well-written nomination; it was 118 pages and truly a delight to read.

Ms. Howard seconded Ms. Strong's comments and said it is an amazing piece of work and an honor to get to consider it. She agreed with Ms. Chave's suggestion about working some of the cultural history into the wording for the designation. She supports based on C, D, E, and F.

Ms. Nicolas said it is a magical place and she supports nomination.

Ms. Tremaine said it is a slam dunk and it is hard to believe that it is not a landmark already. She said it would be nice if someone would notify the Japanese organization for representation during the designation.

Mr. Sheffer said they have been working closely with the consultant on the new entry project and mentioned this to them.

Mr. Lee said the nomination is obvious and well deserved and should be easy for the Board to recognize.

### Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the nomination of the Seattle Japanese Garden at 1075 Lake Washington Boulevard East; the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the entire site, including all structures, site elements and plant material located within the site boundaries based on the following designation standards:

- (C.) *It is associated in a significant way with a significant aspect of the cultural, political, or economic heritage of the community, city, state or nation.*
- (D.) *It embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or of a method of construction.*
- (E.) *It is an outstanding work of a designer or builder*
- (F.) *Because of its prominence of spatial location, contrasts of siting, age, or scale, it is an easily identifiable visual feature of its neighborhood or the city and contributes to the distinctive quality or identity of such neighborhood or city.*

**Action:** I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Seattle Japanese Garden at 1075 Lake Washington Boulevard East, for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include preservation include the entire site, including all structures, site elements and plant material located within the site boundaries; that the public hearing for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for May 21, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

**MM/SC/TV/CH**

10:0:0 Motion approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator