



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 207/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, April 2, 2008– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom
Rebecca Frestedt

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:37 pm

040208.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of February 20, 2008

Deferred.

MM/SC/MT/CH 8:0:2 Minutes deferred until April 2, 2008. Mr. Matthews and Ms. Conti abstained.

040208.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

040208.21 4863 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City Landmark District)
Proposed storefront alterations and signage.

Summary of proposed changes:

Ms. Frestedt distributed photographs and drawings and presented the staff report. She said the intent of the proposed storefront remodel was to expand the amount of

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

glazing and bring the storefront into proportion with the adjacent Columbia City Bakery to the south. She said the alterations include replacement of existing aluminum storefront windows with new wood frame windows; installation of a new wooden door; removal of the interior soffit to expose the clerestory windows; and repainting the storefront and clerestory window trim (pewter grey).

Ms. Frestedt said the existing door and vestibule configuration will be retained. The storefront framing below the windows will feature recessed panels intended to add definition to the composition of the storefront. She said the applicant also proposes to install a 5'6" w x 1'9" h green and white electrical sign cabinet above the canopy. The cabinet will feature neon lettering. The sign box will be constructed of sheet metal with ceramic casings.

Ms. Frestedt said the building, Phalen Hall, was constructed in 1891 and is the oldest commercial building within the District. She said records suggest that the previous storefront alterations occurred in 1968, prior to the establishment of the Historic District. She noted that the exterior renovations to the adjacent storefront (Columbia City Bakery) were approved by the LPB in November 2004.

Applicant comment:

Jennifer Jones, owner of Gather, said the space will house a gallery that will allow for rotating art installations. She said she wants to create an environment where people can have a connection with the art that results in discussion and a stronger connection to the community. She said the name "Gather" was chosen for the "community-ness" of the word and also the gallery will feature a lot of glass. She said that "gathering" is the first step in glass blowing.

Ms. Jones said her idea for the store front is to provide the biggest window space possible to allow great visibility into the store. She said since the space is in the same building as the bakery she didn't want to stray too far from the look of the bakery. She said she hired the same architect that did the bakery remodel since he was familiar with the previous work and was knowledgeable about the structural integrity of the building. She said she looked at historical color palette and chose the gray color because she felt it would work well with the yellow and red without fighting it. She said the door of the space will be the same as the bakery to keep it uniform, and the sign will be made by the same sign maker of the bakery signs. She said the sign cabinet is about the same size as Columbia City Bakery sign so it will be uniform.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith said the proposal was delightfully clear.

Ms. Frestedt said on March 21, 2008 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed exterior alterations and signage.

Mr. Abelsen asked for clarification about the whether or not the white stucco color would be remained.

Ms. Jones said it will stay the same. She said if anything is disturbed she will replace it with the same stucco look and color. She just wants to change the window area, like the bakery, and the rest of the building will retain its stucco finish. In referencing the paint samples she said the green represents the neon cabinet and the beige is the lettering on the neon sign.

Public comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said he would just note that the proposed store front remodel is clearly an improvement.

Ms. Tremaine said she really likes the consistency.

Mr. Lee said it is fantastic.

Mr. Veith said the sign is nice and is nicely detailed in the drawing so they know exactly what is happening. He said it seems to pick up surrounding pattern of signage and street face so it seems to fit right in with the District. He said the proposal appears to meet the District Guidelines.

Ms. Jones said when she was coming up with the logo for the word “Gather” she was inspired by a historic photograph from the District, which she provided to the board. The photograph featured an old sign that said “Drug” and she pulled a lot of the lettering style from that.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed exterior alterations and signage. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

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

Relevant guidelines

2. Building materials and Fixtures. Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building façades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are kin keeping with the historic character of the District.

3. Building Surface Treatments. Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. Painted surfaces shall be:

b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District.

4. Storefront. Building facades should have a greater proportion of window and door openings than wall spaces on pedestrian levels. Any exterior façade alteration shall respect the original architectural integrity of the storefront. Recessed entryways and/or alcoves shall be maintained for existing street-level storefronts. Storefront materials should be brick, wood, concrete, and tile, or a combination thereof.

11. Signs. All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications shall be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District.

b. Blade Signs. Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District.

h. Neon Signs. Neon may be permitted where judged appropriate on a case-by-case basis. Size, letter style, color, intensity and overall impact of the neon sign shall be evaluated for compatibility with the other signs and buildings in the District. Mass-produced neon signs are strongly discouraged.

MM/SC/TV/CH

11:0:0 Motion carried.

040208.22

Cooper House

225 14th Avenue E.

Proposed exterior alterations to accommodate new use.

Summary of proposed changes: Proposed exterior alterations to accommodate new use.

Ms. Chave introduced Linda Saltzer from the Dwelling Company and said the proposal is for revision to the previously approved plans for the Cooper House. She said the Architectural Review Committee has seen the revisions of the current proposal a couple of times. She said the Dwelling Company is changing its use from when the previously approved Certificate of Approval was issued. She said although the Board doesn't review use, since DPD is requiring changes for the new non-residential use, the applicants are having to come back to the Landmarks Preservation Board to request approval of those changes. She said these changes are primarily front yard changes which were triggered by parking, and a stair tower on the north elevation of the building.

Mr. Lee confirmed that this also included the ADA access ramp.

Ms. Saltzer with the Dwelling Company said their intent when they started was to not make any changes from what was approved but because they were changing it to a commercial use they were required to add a handicapped rail and another access out of the building. She said they tried a lot of different things with the stairwell and ended up with what is presented today.

Ms. Chave said there was discussion about the landscaping regarding the DPD requirements for higher hedge but those were items that she thought could be dealt with at another level, that the Board could go ahead and approve the plans that were presented today and applicant could pursue with DPD a lower hedge later. She said height of hedges can be dealt with in another venue.

Ms. Saltzer said they have an approved MUP for conditional use in regard to building improvements so they are quite ready to start construction. She said the Dwelling Company will be moving its office into the building.

Ms. Chave said there was discussion at ARC about placement of windows on the proposed tower and the applicant did look at alternatives at different window placements and went back to original plan with slight modifications.

Ms. Saltzer confirmed they did and that they tried different types and then no windows at all and went back to the original plan. She said the addition on the back is actually screened quite well by the landscaping.

Board Questions:

Ms. Veith said there is a note on the drawing and asked if the documents had been redrawn to show the new.

Ms. Chave asked Ms. Saltzer for a drawing showing on the railing not showing the pickets.

Mr. Veith said the note on the drawing says “black rail, no pickets” which is what was talked about. He said there is some color, tone below the top of the railing and he asked if that denoted a material.

Ms. Saltzer said there is no glass in there.

Mr. Martinson asked if it was just an open rail.

Ms. Saltzer responded yes.

Ms. Chave said that drawing needs to be revised before the Certificate of Approval can be issued.

Public Comment:

Christine Palmer, Preservation Advocate for Historic Seattle, said the Board members might remember Paul Slane who took the lead of landmarking this property in 2005. She said he died in 2006 and his friends and family and Historic Seattle have carried on the monitoring of the evolution of this property. She said they think this is a wonderful adaptation of this historic property and are excited about what the Dwelling Company is doing and hopes the Board will approve as submitted. She said they have concerns about the tall hedge that is required by DPD and ask that it not be put in place; they don't want it to obscure the beauty of the landmark. She said if help and support are needed to remove the hedge requirement they would be glad to do so.

Ms. Chave said if they would like to write a letter of support if the applicants choose to pursue it we could include that.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews said he thinks it is fine and would have preferred it without the side extension but it is a life safety requirement. He said they kept it simple and it is screened. He said he hopes they can put pressure to reduce the height of the hedge since there is nothing but a Safeway parking lot with a hedge opposite it so the hedge really serves no purpose in protecting people from headlights, if that is what it is for.

Mr. Lee said ARC thought it was a good scheme.

Ms. Tremaine said they did a nice job.

Mr. Veith said it is a good solution. He said one could argue about a couple details on the tower itself but it is going to be far back from the street and covered by foliage so it will be barely perceptible by secondary façade. He said it is entirely appropriate way to handle the requirement.

Action: “I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations to accommodate the new use, including a new enclosed stairway, ramp and site alterations.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Controls and Incentives Agreement 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*.

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

MM/SC/HM/VA

11:0:0 Motion carried.

040208.3

DESIGNATION

040208.41

Charlestown Court
3811 California Ave SW

Applicant comment:

Melody McCutcheon, representing the property owner, said at the nomination meeting on February 20, David Peterson, architect from Nicholson Kovalchick provided a factual presentation about the building; he would be presenting following her remarks. She said at that time he had not evaluated as to whether is met landmark criteria or not; since then he has done the evaluation and sent a letter containing his evaluation. She said he looked at the quality of the original design and compared it to the inventory of this housing type. She said since the nomination meeting the owners hired her and she has come to learn about bungalow courts because she worked on Reid Court where Larry Johnson gave an analysis of bungalow courts. She said his analysis of the typology identified what the key elements of that style were. She said it is a good reminder that the landmark criteria contain a lead in threshold criteria that a building has to have significant character,

interest or value to the City as well as meeting one of the six. She said it is not enough to nominate a building just because it has charming elements; a landmark is supposed to be a really special building.

Ms. McCutcheon said for all who believe in the landmark process it is important for the integrity of the process that the criteria are followed. She said the decisions need to be solid. She said that Historic Seattle asked to designate the building and while they respect the opinion they do not address threshold criterion of whether the building adds significant character, interest or value to the City. She said they talked about some of the building elements but they never related it back to the bungalow court typology and whether this project has those elements or not.

Ms. McCutcheon said there was an email campaign going and said she knows they are sincere but she said a lot of it is motivated by a fear of what is coming based on the townhouses and mixed use projects they have seen, that they don't like the quality of the new. She said she appreciates that but the issue is not landmarking something because of what you fear will happen but landmarking because of the building itself. She urged the Board to evaluate the building itself and apply the criteria.

David Peterson with Nicholson Kovalchick said he also represented the owner. He said his presentation would be an audio/visual version of the letter which follows the Landmark Criteria A – F and would provide a comparison of this building to other similar. He said the building is a U-shape building on California Ave. SW which was designed by William H. Whitely and built in 1927. He said to the north of the property is a 7-11 store and to the south is a multi-unit townhouse development constructed in 2006.

Mr. Peterson showed a 1937 photo of the building and said it is brick clad, U-shaped, Tudor style, four apartments. He said the bungalow court form developed in the early 1900s in Pasadena by a couple different architects, and was popularized as detached free-standing bungalows usually in the Craftsman style. He said it dovetailed with the Craftsman movement and became very popular in Southern California; it started out to attract vacationers to spend time in Southern California without having to stay at a hotel. He said using the outline that the Johnson Partnership developed for the Reid Court apartments because the term “bungalow court” is frequently misapplied to buildings it shouldn't be applied to. He said the Johnson Partnership survey came up with four items that describe the typology; he said it is rare to find a project that meets all four and just because all four are not there does not mean it is not a bungalow court. He said the farther away you get from the Johnson Partnership survey, the less it can be considered a bungalow court.

Mr. Peterson said although it began as detached houses around a pedestrian courtyard, over time it morphed into a more u-shaped building and frequently dropped the Craftsman detailing. He said the ideal was the free-standing houses in a pedestrian court with Craftsman detailing. He presented the Johnson typology: single story detached, differentiated semi-detached units grouped around a pedestrian court; the courtyard is entered from the street through some form of gateway to provide a hierarchical transition from the public street to the semi-private court and then to the private domain, frequently the semi-private space allows for individualization by the tenant which helps dovetail into the Craftsman ideals of association with nature;

although not essential, simple Craftsman detailing within the project to evoke positive association with the philosophy of the Arts and Crafts movement.

Mr. Peterson said a good example is a project in the Central District from 1915, about the same period. He said it has a gate forming a clear threshold between public and the semi-private space of the interior courtyard; in this case the interior courtyard is linear which frequently happened on urban lots. He said the next step to the private domain of the house is met with the steps up to a private porch which have been individualized by different owners and reflects the ideal of living in nature in the city that the bungalow court was intended to provide.

Another example Mr. Peterson provided which was constructed in 1917 and designed by Carl Brighton who he assumed is the same architect from Brighton Kluckenberg, prominent architects of many Catholic buildings in the City. Mr. Peterson said although it is a simpler project is still has Craftsman detailing. It does not have as prominent gateway as in other projects but there is more space between the units; the porches are notable and spacious and windows are still intact.

Mr. Peterson said Montrose Court, located on Queen Anne, was constructed in 1927 and designed by William H. Whitely and probably is his best work. It is a U-shape building and has a garage associated with it; the units are entered off the courtyard. He said there is a brick gateway with steps up from the street providing a clear threshold and the inside of the courtyard is a clearly defined purposefully planned garden space, separate from the public realm and yet usable by the people who live in the units and provides quasi-private space as you approach. He said at the covered entries you would move into the private realm. The porch entries to this building are not as prominent as other projects to be seen later in this presentation, which reinforces that it is rare to find a project that meets the criteria 100%. He noted the amount of detailing on this project, the barge boards, the board and batten at the bay windows, the brick work with the lozenge pattern that goes all around the building including the garage.

Mr. Peterson showed photos of Freidlander Court on Alki and said it was built in 1926 and is notable that it is from the same period and has a well defined garden courtyard. There is a gateway with a clear threshold from public to semi-private; the garden is a planned space with a fountain and raised planter and the entries are marked by tile-roofed porchlets. Six units are entered off the courtyard and four are entered from the sides.

Mr. Peterson presented another example and said the project is not in the Tudor style and more in the Colonial style; he said because the building type was so popular architects would take the idea of a bungalow court and adapt it to the site or the developers needs. He said this site exhibits three buildings and two linear courts that go down the side; there is still an entry courtyard through a major gateway with clear threshold between private and quasi-private realm, large porches and clearly provided wayfinding devices for the people who live there and also provide transitional space before moving into private space of the unit. He said there are ten units in this complex.

Mr. Peterson presented a 1930 project in Madison Park. He said it has a central u-shape and the courtyard and two linear bars that face either end of the two streets. He

said between the u-shape and the two bars are service corridors which provide back doors for all the units, which is not uncommon in bungalow courts. He said the size of the courtyard, while small, is very well detailed and every effective in giving a sense of a threshold with a gateway, a planned garden space. Further building details include very nice clinker bricks; the exposed eaves and the woodwork.

Mr. Peterson said there are a lot of buildings like this in Seattle and in his PowerPoint provided photos of bungalow courts in Seattle that he didn't have time to go into further detail on. He said there are a lot of examples that have a courtyard element but through the inventiveness of the architect combines them with other elements. He provided relatively recent photographs of Charlestown Court with the townhouse construction to the south and the 7-11 store to the north. He said it is two lots south of the intersection of California Avenue SW and Charlestown. He said he was trying to show the building as it exists today and the courtyard. He said going through the landmark criteria A., B, C, he could not find any indication that any of them would fit.

Using the Johnson Criteria, Mr. Peterson said single story detached or semi detached units grouped around a pedestrian court; it is one story and it does have a pedestrian court so it does meet. He said the court must be entered from the street through some sort of gateway sufficient to create a hierarchical transition from the street to semi-private court and then to private domain. He said there is a courtyard at Charlestown Court but there is not a clear transition from the street into the courtyard; they space just melts into the public realm. There is no sense of a semi-private courtyard as one moves through the space. He said compared to other examples presented, from the same period, the gateway is very important to provide separation and also the level of detail seen in the other projects: the brick work and the planned garden space which is lacking in the Charlestown Court project. The porches in Charlestown Court extend into the space but without any communication with the garden space; they seem almost accidental. He said at Montrose Court there are a variety of entries, a recessed arched entry for one unit under a gable, another projecting porch lit again providing people opportunities to individualize them. He said although not essential simple Craftsman detailing; the building is not Craftsman style, however the elements of Tudor Revival Style are things such as the bell curve roof meeting the arched gate entry, the simply patterned projecting chimneys, the field of red brick which is simple and the asymmetrical porch cover over one unit with open gable end which provides an asymmetry to the project which was not typical in that style. He said it does not build on those characteristics any more than that and so although it is identifiably Tudor Revival it is average.

Mr. Peterson said with regard to integrity, just under half of the windows have been switched out, most notably he windows on either side of the chimneys at the gable ends which were the only windows that had the vertical large heavy central mullion for the two casement windows.; they are entirely replaced on the south side and half replaced on the north side. He said the leaded glass windows have been replaced.

Mr. Peterson said regarding criterion E, William H. Whitely, worked on the Banks and Mock Bakery which is a block long façade of nice terracotta work, Rosina Court and the Montrose Court. With regard to context, he said that California Avenue is a mix of sizes and ages and materials; it is heavily treed. Charlestown Court doesn't stick out any more than any other project, it fits in with one to four story scale of

buildings from all eras, all sizes, different set backs etc., so it does not meet Criterion F either.

Board Questions:

Mr. Lee said in the original photographs the hedge goes all the way across the courtyard.

Mr. Peterson said there is a hedge planted at the corner of the stair.

Mr. Lee said they had been removed.

Mr. Peterson concurred.

Mr. Veith said the hedges that were removed were just inboard to the court, in front of the stairs.

Mr. Peterson said they were just inboard of the end of the stairs.

Mr. Veith said they do make a gateway there.

Ms. Tremaine said the stairs also make an entrance even though it is going to the sidewalk.

Public Comment:

Paul Cesmat, owner of Charlestown Court said the porches were redone in 1969 and the stairs were reshaped or done differently.

Board comments:

Mr. Hannum said he went down the list and said he doesn't think it meets the criteria. He said he is concerned about some of the original fabric that has been changed and though it could be restored he said he doesn't think it meets the criteria and there are other better examples

Mr. Matthews said any type or style that we look at will have examples in elite residential districts and also examples in less affluent places. The preservation movement started with mansions and it took quite a long time to reach vernacular building. He said he thinks this is on the vernacular end and it is interesting that Whitely, who designed very beautiful, rather expensively built courtyard housing – he said he hesitates to call it all bungalow court because the Craftsman style aspect is not really relevant to this, but he designed elegant buildings around courtyards on Capitol Hill for largely well to do people. This is similar kind of idea transferred to less affluent surroundings and he feels that it should be considered as an excellent example in those circumstances; he said he would vote yes based on Criteria D.

Ms. Conti said she always thinks it is a struggle when contemplating the difference between the higher end architectural structures and the common man architectural structures; she doesn't think this one meets the threshold.

Ms. Howard said she does think the relevant Criterion is D; it is a wonderful example of a Tudor Revival style applied to a more modest buildings. She said her concern is with the integrity and the replacement of the windows, the replacement of the porches and she doesn't think she can support the designation.

Ms. Nicholas said because of the scale, style of the building and where it is situated she said Criterion D doesn't congeal with what she is seeing and she wouldn't support designation.

Ms. Tremaine said the building is 81 years old and according to the letter it does say the basic architectural elements are intact. She said it is a nice example of a vernacular Tudor court (she said she wouldn't say bungalow and went back Larry Johnson's report); she said knowing Larry she thinks he probably stretches it some ways too, because not everything is exactly those four elements. It doesn't have a court although that according to the letters that came from the public when the man named Barney owned it, it was in good condition and he took good care of it so the bones of the building are still pretty good. She said items that are important are the chimneys, which are fake, with unique fake fireplaces inside, the portals, gates on sides of the building, the asymmetrical gabled roof entrance are all items that are worth noting. The fact that it needs tuck pointing and that it has some window problems, most of the things we look at have window problems because they've all been changed out, so that isn't a big issue. The fact that it is between townhouses and a 7-11 isn't pertinent; we have to look at the building for what it is and how it looks. On California Avenue it is one of the buildings that one would look at and say "that is different". There are a lot of things along the Avenue and this one does stick out. It is worthy of designation and she would support it based on D.

Mr. Abelsen said Mr. Matthews' and Ms. Tremaine's comments are thoughtful; he doesn't have much to add to that. Criterion D is the only one that would be appropriate; he said that it is a vernacular style rather than a high end or trying to fit into bungalow court style. He said he is trying to understand what a bungalow court once was considered and how it might have evolved. This building has some of the elements of a court style collection of buildings but he wouldn't characterize it as a bungalow court. He said it is a pretty unique style and doesn't know if would support designation.

Mr. Veith said he is seeing a trend in presentations. He said the Board has its standards set out in the Ordinance and in the Secretary of the Interior Standards and Guidelines. He said the Board has seen some presentations lately where people assign a building to a style or an approach and then criticize it for not being a pure or perfect example of that style. He said that is a really bad road to go down. He said Mr. Johnson was asked to review the bungalow courts when the Reid Court came up and he did an excellent job in giving a lot of valuable information that can be used for comparative purposes but he doesn't want to get into a situation where this Board is using Mr. Johnson's standards to judge a building. He said the goal of these guides wasn't to be pure purveyors of style copyists but to re-imagine their building using these historical references. Often the most interesting examples are the ones that aren't pure, that combine different elements from different styles. He said there is a small audience today and perhaps this speech won't have much affect on what comes before the Board but he said he wants to give a sense of what he is thinking about when he hears a long discussion about why something isn't a particular style, it is not

really meaningful to him because each building has to be considered on its own term as it comes to the Board whether it meets the standards. He said looking at the standards the Board is supposed to consider and said he agrees with the applicant that standards A, B, C which relate the building to a specific event, person or some component of our heritage, clearly the building does not meet any of those standards. He said it is not an outstanding example of the work of this architect so would not fit E. He said the building does have some prominence; the siting is not terribly prominent or its prominence or its siting is that a newer building has been set back and it opens up the corner of the building. Overall it doesn't have prominence of siting, it does have contrast in age and to a lesser degree scale, but it doesn't have a significant contrast or a significant difference in scale and we can't just meet the requirement, it has to be significant. Looking at D, this is the only criterion, as other Board members have mentioned, that we can consider. He said it is fairly typical of buildings done in this period so it is a good example of the work in that period and that general approach to building. It has some integrity issues and the value of the comparison that we saw, that Mr. Johnson did that was repeated by the applicant, it is clear that it is not the best example of a style or a particularly good or rich version of the method of construction so he said he it doesn't make it makes it as a landmark. He said it doesn't clearly rise to the level of any of the criteria that we look at so he will vote not to designate.

Mr. Martinson said he thought it could meet Criterion D but he doesn't think it meets the threshold.

Ms. Strong said she cannot support designation; she said if it qualified at all it would be based on D; it doesn't rise to the level of distinct.

Mr. Lee said he is in agreement with Mr. Matthews on a number of points. He said it was probably more of a courtyard when it had the hedges in front. He said it is a little architectural gem on a very busy street. He said he likes the building, the design, the asymmetrical entrance. Whether it rises to significance, he said he didn't know. He said we have to be aware of good design and decent architecture at every level; it is not a mansion but a nice blue collar version. He said he thinks it does rise to the level of significance and would vote yes for it.

Action:

"I move that the Board **not** approve the designation of the as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not meet any of the designation standards of SMC 25.12.350"

MM/SC/MS/MH
opposed.

8:3:0 Mr. Lee, Mr. Matthews, Ms. Tremaine

040208.42

Women's University Club
1105 Sixth Avenue

Kate Krafft, Architectural Historian presented the nomination on behalf of the City. Ms. Krafft showed a photo of the Women's University Club building, located at the corner of Sixth and Spring which shows the building, built in 1922 as well as the 1962 addition which is not under consideration for designation. She said the Women's University Club (WUC) appears to meet three of the criteria for

designation according to the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Ordinance. She said it is associated in a significant way with a significant aspect of the cultural, political heritage of the community, City, State or Nation. The WUC is directly associated with the 20th Century era; between 1920 and 1930 when the downtown commercial district was fully established; she showed press clipping from 1921 when the club was forced to move from their original club building due to the construction of the Olympic Hotel. She said despite ever increasing commercial real estate development throughout early decades of the early decades of the 20th Century, major new churches, fraternal halls and club buildings continued to be constructed in the evolving and expanding downtown commercial district. She provided photos of a few of these clubs, all of which were men's organizations. The WUC is highly unique as a downtown women's clubhouse constructed during this era. She said it was specifically designed, financed and constructed to serve as a downtown clubhouse for this local education-based women's organization that was originally established in 1914. She said the WUC has been in continuous use for club purposes since its construction in 1922.

Ms. Krafft said with regard to Standard D, it embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or a method of construction. The WUC is notable for its architectural character as well as a preserved clubhouse building exhibiting distinctive materials and architectural features indicative of Federal and Georgian Revival styles. She said the symmetrically composed facades are clad in red brick and capped by a denticulated cornice. The Sixth Avenue façade is dominated by a Georgian inspired central entry vestibule with a recessed porch. The arched vestibule opening is terracotta clad and surmounted by an ornate broken scroll pediment with a central finial and flanked by classically composed terracotta pilasters. She said another ornate Georgian inspired terracotta clad entry way at Spring Street leads to the basement level auditorium and assembly space. Originally double hung wood windows with a multi-paned twelve over twelve pattern and narrow mullions remain in place at the principal elevations. At the first floor level window openings are surmounted by recessed blind arch and accentuated by terracotta keystones and corner blocks. The second floor windows are trimmed with brick voussoirs, terracotta keystones and terracotta sills.

Ms. Krafft said it is an outstanding work of a designer or builder. The original clubhouse was designed by two important Seattle architects: A. H. Albertson and E. F. Champney. Mr. Albertson was one of the City's most prominent and prolific architects; he initially served as the local representative of Howells and Stokes, a prestigious New York Architecture Firm. He prepared the development plans and the designs for several buildings on the metropolitan tract for the Metropolitan Building Company including the design for the original Women's University Clubhouse building that was constructed in 1914. Mr. Albertson is also well known for a number of other buildings including the Northern Life Tower and the downtown YMCA, Cornish School, St. Joe's Church and buildings on the UW campus. Mr. Champney was one of the few Pacific Northwest architects to have formal Ecole des Beaux Arts academic architectural training. He is best known for his work on the YWCA which he designed in association with A. Warren Gould. Champney often served as an architectural associate on large projects with other architects and appears to have produced the initial published rendering from the 1921 newspaper and the rendering of the revised design and his name is included on all the architectural drawing and the press release.

Regarding physical integrity, Ms. Krafft said the exterior of the WUC is exceptionally well preserved and exhibits good physical integrity. She provided images from 1922, 1937, and 2007. The most substantial alteration made to the exterior of the clubhouse building is the installation of a modern canvas entry way canopy. The canopy extends from the entry vestibule into the sidewalk area; it is attached to the ornate terracotta surround at the face of the vestibule, at points within the vestibule and supported by brass tube posts at the side. The canopy covers portions of the terracotta surround and includes infill panel within the arched opening that obscures views of the ornate fan light above the entry door. A modern steel security gate assembly has been installed at the Spring Street entry way that leads to the basement auditorium and assembly hall space. She said those are the two major alterations to the exterior of the building.

She said the WUC appears to be worthy of recognition for its historic, cultural and architectural significance.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith said she mentioned the intermediate cornice and asked if she was referring to the band between the 2nd and 3rd floors.

Ms. Krafft concurred; there actually are two. It functions as intermediate cornice on the Spring Street elevation accentuating the basement level from the main bulk of the building. There is another smaller cornice below the 3rd floor.

Mr. Veith said she was talking about the big band which he would refer to as a water table. He asked of all the people who spoke at the club over the years, is there a particular person or persons who might be significant.

Ms. Krafft said Eleanor Roosevelt dined there and spoke.

Suzanne Price of the Women's University Club said Mrs. Roosevelt spoke there 69 years ago on March 28, 1939 and cited a March 29, 1939 newspaper article about the visit which talked about men in white coats opening the doors under the canopy of the Women's University Club. She said there has been a canopy there at least since 1939.

Ms. Krafft said she has seen references to it but never a photograph. She said women who were very involved during WWI era were very influential in the founding of the club and while we don't have their names today, with a bit of research she said it is likely one would be impressed with their credentials.

Mr. Veith asked if there was any association with the Temperance Movement.

Ms. Krafft said not that she knew of.

Ms. Price said there was no alcohol in the club until the 1950s or 1960s.

Owner Comment:

Ms. Price said they are pleased that the Board did not nominate the 1962 addition and agree that two or three of the Standards are met. She said they have prided themselves in maintaining it well. She said last Friday night the last secretary to Mrs. Roosevelt spoke at the club so they are still continuing threads of history through the years.

Public Comment: None.

Board Comment:

Ms. Strong said she will support designation based on C, D and E she said it is a beautiful club and it has played such an important role in the City especially for women and is honored to vote for designation.

Mr. Martinson said yes based on C, D and E and maybe F.

Mr. Veith said it is a very elegant version of an elegant style. The Georgian Federalist style is very clean and regular and this is a particularly strong example of that approach. He said it embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of that style. He said it is associated with events discussed earlier but also in a general association that is significant with a way of young women living in the City. He said that is an important component of the building's history, so could support Criterion C. He said he is not sure he would view this building as an outstanding work of the designer, that the Northern Life Tower and St. Joe's Church were outstanding examples of his works. He was a good architect and worked with Wilson, who was regarded also as an excellent designer; with Richardson who had reputation for being more of the technician in the partnership. He said he thinks this building is probably not one of their top buildings but if C, D and E were all included in the designation description he would not vote against it on the basis of E being included. He said yes on at least C and D.

Mr. Abelsen said yes based on C, largely because of its association with women and their advancement and activities in the City and that it is very important for that to be recognized. The building is quite evident of distinctive visible characteristics of the Federalist style with the Georgian detailing; it is unique in how it was put together. He said the designer probably had to deal with a lower pot of money and was a bit restrained in what they could do with the building and for that reason he thinks it is an outstanding work. He said yes on all three criteria.

Ms. Tremaine said yes on C, D and E; it is elegant and has served a good purpose in the City.

Ms. Nicholas said yes on C, D and E; it is a great building and the history that it stands for is important and it is a wonderful addition to the City.

Ms. Howard said yes on C, D and E especially C. She said it is important that it was a club not just for women but for university educated women and that is hugely significant in our history.

Ms. Conti said yes on C, D and E.

Mr. Matthews said yes on C, D, and E. With regard to C Eleanor Roosevelt scores a bit higher than some people who have been named as making buildings significant. He said it does well on all three criteria.

Mr. Hannum said yes on C, D and E. He said it is important to note that it was a university women's club. He said although it isn't as monumental as some of the other works of the designer, the fact that it is restrained and elegant makes it a landmark.

Mr. Lee said he supports it on C, D and E and said it is tough to pull off design and make it elegant and thinks it looks better being more restrained in terms of the detail. He said he appreciates the design of the building a lot; it is significant in the City for all the reasons that have been mentioned and it certainly qualifies under C, D and E.

Ms. Krafft asked if she could make one comment and said she thought it important Albertson's association with the initial club and they went back to him again for the design of the building; they really loved the original building. He partnered with Champney in the design; Champney left Seattle in 1926 so there are very few buildings that are associated with him.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Women's University Club at 1105 Sixth Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building, excluding the 1962 addition.

MM/SC/CH/AC

11:0:0 Motion carried.

040208.5

CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

040208.51

Terminal Sales Annex
1921 Second Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt said the applicant has briefed ARC twice and they want to coordinate their Certificate of Approval with the Controls Agreement approval; in order to do that they have to wait until the environmental review is completed. Until that is completed they want an extension for sixty days.

Mr. Abelsen asked how long they have been in review.

Ms. Sodt said she is not sure but fairly recently they completed their MUP application. She said she suggested sixty days because that is standard and the applicant can asked for another extension if it is needed. They will continue to brief at ARC.

There was general discussion about the length of the deferral and it was agreed that sixty days would be voted on.

Deferred for sixty days.

MM/SC/TV/VA

11:0:0

040208.52 Bon Marche Stables
2315 Western Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt said applicant asked for a sixty day extension; they have submitted a letter that they are willing to negotiate and want time to meet with staff and discuss Controls and Incentives.

Deferred for sixty days.
MM/SC/TV/MH 11:0:0

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator