



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 531/09

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday October 7, 2009 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Tom Veith  
Vernon Abelsen  
Marie Strong  
Aaron Luoma  
Meredith Wirsching  
Steve Savage  
Alyce Conti  
Stephen Lee  
Christine Howard  
Mark Hannum

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Mollie Tremaine

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

#### **100709.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meeting of August 19, 2009

Action: to approve the minutes as amended.

MM/SC/CH/MS

7:0:3 Ms. Conti, Messrs. Luoma and  
Abelsen abstained.

#### Public Disclosure/Disclaimer Statement

Consistent with the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, all records within the possession of the City may be subject to a public disclosure request and may be distributed or copied. Records include and are not limited to sign-in sheets, contracts, emails, notes, correspondence, etc. Use of lists of individuals or directory information (including address, phone or E-mail) may not be used for commercial purposes.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

**100709.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

100709.21 3711-3717 S. Angeline St.  
(Columbia City Landmark District)  
Proposed new paint color scheme.

Rebecca Frestedt summarized the application for the proposed revised paint color scheme. Exhibits included photographs, drawings and color samples. She explained that the LPB approved a Certificate of Approval for Final Design in July 2006 and approved a series of minor revisions to the Final Design in June 2007. She said on September 25, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for new paint colors.

Josh Beloff, property owner, explained the intent to change the paint color in order to upgrade the building and create a better fit within the district. He said the current color scheme doesn't relate to the community. He said he was inspired by the color scheme on the SE Youth and Family Services building because it accentuates the architectural details. He proposed two colors and stated that in keeping with the modern design of the building he is not proposing an accent color for the trim detail.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum said that the CCRC discussed the change from a light to dark color scheme and said determined it was acceptable and met the guidelines.

Mr. Beloff explained the intent to put the lighter color on the lower portion of the building to lighten up the courtyard. In response to a question from the Board, he said that the roof is a brownish color with a hint of red.

Mr. Veith stated that the color scheme is neutral. Ms. Howard and Messrs. Hannum and Lee called it an improvement.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for paint colors. 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 Columbia City Design Guidelines:**

**Guidelines/Specific**

**3. Building Surface Treatments.** Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an "historic colors" palette that may be useful as a guide. The Board Coordinator also has a palette of historic colors that may be used as reference.

MM/SC/MS/MH

10:0:0 Motion carried.

100709.22

3815 S. Edmunds St.  
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Preliminary design of a new 3-story building to be constructed on the lot adjacent to the Shirley Marvin Apartments. The proposal includes the addition of a 1-story glass atrium that would connect the new building to the existing Shirley Marvin building.

Ms. Frestedt explained that there was a recent DPD determination that the proposed development would trigger SEPA due to the overall square footage of the new and extant building. As a result, she said the application has been deferred until SEPA decision has been published.

**100709.3**

**DESIGNATIONS**

100709.31

Baroness Apartments  
1005 Spring Street

Mr. Veith recused himself.

Douglas Grove representing Virginia Mason introduced Susan Boyle of BOLA Architects.

Susan Boyle presented the nomination report (full report in DON file) and provided context of the First Hill area pointing out the early mix of mansions, institutions, private clubs and hotels and the increased urbanization of the area over time. She explained it was the first comprehensive zone in the City and was designated as an apartment zone and allowed for increased heights. She said the building was built in 1930-31 and went on to describe building details noting the original marquee (no longer there) with detailing that matched the Bon Marche building. She explained this is the only building by the Macintosh-Truman Lumber Company and was constructed as an apartment hotel with a dining area, kitchen, fireplace lounge, and a music area. She noted that floors two and three were known as the echelon floor levels which were rental units: small studio units with a kitchenette and two two-bedroom units. She explained the plan was typical but what was unusual was the clarity of the structure – it is a fire proof brick concrete frame building - and the Deco details. She said it was designed by James Shack and went on to point out the Deco style with the vertical elements and rusticated based and was made up of painted concrete, brick veneer and cast stone. She pointed out the typical Art Deco details - floral and sea forms and the zig zag treatment. She said the building is intact with only a few changes and called attention to the way the bricks are layed out at the top parapet on the main façade noting the serrated affect. She said on the south side the decorative treatment on the upper floors ends although it is brick clad and the painted concrete rusticated base carries around the entire south side. The east façade is stucco clad concrete along the alley. She noted the contrast of the narrow steel window sash against the large

elements and heavy cladding. She noted the entry doorway and relite are new and the sconce lights original. She provided photos of examples of other local Art Deco styled buildings: the Northern Life Building and U. S. Marine Hospital among others.

Ms. Boyle explained that architect James Shack had a long career and worked with Huntington on the former United Methodist Church and later the Seattle Civic Auditorium and the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. She noted the letters in support of designation and that the building has been cited in publications as one of the finest examples of Art Deco in the City. She said it is an innovative and unusual design of Shack.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum agreed with the Staff Report noting it is a wonderful example of the style. He supported designation on D and E stating that Criterion E was the weaker of the two.

Ms. Conti said it is an amazing design and supported designation based on criteria D and E.

Mr. Luoma supported designation based on the Staff recommendation of D and E and said it embodies a distinctive style specifically calling out the Deco details, the verticality and the base that grounds it.

Ms. Howard supported designation based on Criterion E describing it as an outstanding work of Shack.

Ms. Wirsching supported designation based on criteria D and E stating it is an excellent example of a Deco mid-rise building.

Ms. Strong supported designation based on criteria D and E calling it a welcoming building.

Mr. Abelsen supported designation based on criteria D and E and said it is a wonderful Art Deco building noting the detailing. He said he was astounded by the rusticated based and said there aren't enough works by Shack and this was a top-notch representation of his work.

Mr. Savage supported designation based on criteria D and E.

Mr. Lee said it is a lovely building and supported designation based on criteria D and E.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Baroness Apartments, 1005 Spring Street a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

100709.32

Rhododendron Apartments/Inn at Virginia Mason  
1006 Spring Street

Sonia Sokol-Fürész presented the nomination report (full report in DON file) beginning with providing context of the area. The Building was completed in 1928 during a time of major apartment construction in the City and was touted at the time as “one of the most modern in the country”. She pointed out the largely unaltered exterior of the 8-9 story building which is constructed of reinforced concrete columns and floors with hollow clay tile infill walls. She explained the primary and west facades are arranged into the classically-derived composition of base, shaft, cap and parapet. She pointed out the band of patterned brick separating the shaft and cap. She noted the plain secondary facades on the east and north facades. The main entrance is centered on the south façade and is emphasized by a slight projection carried up the entire façade. She pointed out the decorative glazed tile at the entry vestibule exhibiting images of the rhododendrons. She explained the building is stylistically eclectic with Gothic Revival suggested by the finials.

Ms. Sokol-Fürész went over some interior details noting the entry lobby features a diamond-patterned terrazzo floor with marble perimeter and base, textured plaster walls with decorative plasterwork crown molding. Wood doors with leaded glazing open from the main lobby onto the brick-paved courtyard at the north side of the building. A wide arched opening in the wall between the dining room and the lobby corridor is fitted with a wood window, with leaded glazing featuring art glass details with rhododendron flowers.

Ms. Sokol-Fürész reported the building was designed by developer and architect John S. Hudson who did many joint projects with his brother, Harry. He primarily did apartment buildings in the Capital Hill and First Hill neighborhoods in the 1910s and 1920s. Other apartment buildings constructed by Hudson include the John Alden, Lowell Emerson, Chasselton and the Northcliffe among others. She noted letters of support for designation from Washington Trust and Historic Seattle. She said the building met Criterion D because it is a strong expression of a period of apartment building and for its eclectic style. Responding to Board member questions she explained she didn't think it met Criterion E because they didn't have the full range of knowledge about Hudson.

Mr. Abelson noted Hudson's uncommon role as both builder and designer and noted the completeness of the design.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, explained that all Hudson's buildings have wonderful qualities in terms of the styles used.

In response to clarifying questions Ms. Sokol-Fürész said she didn't find any record of alterations having been done in the courtyard and that the brick paving could be original. She said she didn't think Hudson occupied the penthouse.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Savage did not support designation noting the building was “marginal”.

Mr. Abelson supported designation based on criteria D and E.

Ms. Strong supported designation on Criterion D, noting the building’s context to the street.

Ms. Wirsching said the architecture is not unique and while attractive the building doesn’t rise to the standard of landmark status and is more appropriate as part of a district.

Ms. Howard supported designation noting the building’s completeness of execution and said all the details support the larger design. She supported criteria D and E.

Mr. Luoma supported designation based on Criterion D expressing appreciation for the completeness of the presentation and he noted all the minute details that brought together the eclectic combination of styles that merit designation.

Ms. Conti supported designation noting it is a lovely building and that she enjoyed its mass and eclectic style. She said the building has integrity and supported a district in the area.

Mr. Hannum said the building doesn’t rise to the status of landmark and did not support designation although he would support a district.

Mr. Savage said “stylistic eclectic” is not enough and that he would not support designation but he would be in support of a district.

Mr. Lee did not support designation because he did not see it as significant but as more of a background building.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Rhododendron Apartments, 1006 Spring Street a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building, the interior of the main entry lobby, and the site.

MM/SC/VA/MS

5:4:1 Motion failed. Mr. Veith recused himself; Ms. Wirsching, Messrs. Hannum, Lee and Savage opposed.

**100709.4**

**NOMINATIONS**

100709.41

500 Dexter Avenue North

Rachel Ben-Schmuel, representing the owner, said the buildings (500 Dexter Avenue North and 522-524 Dexter Avenue North) do not appear to meet any criteria for landmark status. She introduced Sonia Sokol-Fürész and Susan Boyle who would present the nomination reports (reports available in DON file).

Susan Boyle explained the building was built in 1951 as a garage and is now occupied by the Barking Lounge. The building is single story concrete block with two primary facades. She provided context of the area and went over development of the area over time noting the post-war era represented a break in development patterns with more industry and commercial with a decline in residential. She explained that while architect Otis Hancock worked with various noted architects – Loveless, Priteca and Fowler - he was a secondary architect and not well-known.

She said the building was built by Western Union Telegraph Company which occupied the building from 1951 through the late 1960s. She went over Western Union history, the technology and its presence in Seattle. Western Union came to Seattle in the 1870s and by 1900 was one of several telegraph companies located in Seattle downtown commercial core. After WWII it expanded into the suburbs and this building was associated with that expansion. She explained that TV and radio brought about the demise of the telegraph. This building was occupied during the company's waning presence on culture.

Ms. Boyle went over building details noting it is a plain commercial building noting it is a concrete frame with windows. She pointed out the non-original mechanical units on the roof and the exterior duct work as well as the many interior changes that have been made over time. She said that what she found interesting is the use of manufactured wood truss that form the bowstring roof form because this technology emerged during the war period using smaller pieces and represents the beginning of engineered wood systems but it doesn't mean it is a distinctive characteristic. She said the building does not meet any criteria for nomination.

Mr. Veith asked if some of the infill is concrete and/or CMU.

Ms. Boyle said most of it is CMU but it is stucco clad in some areas.

Ms. Sokol-Fürész added that some CMU is visible as infill and on the primary façade are just windows.

Ms. Boyle explained there is some parch coating so it is not real detectable and also noted the windows are industrial steel sash.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said it is a simple and restrained building with a good application of attributes but no association to meet criteria A, B, or C. He said it doesn't meet any of the criteria.

Mr. Savage said it does not meet any criteria and would not support nomination.

Mr. Abelsen did not support nomination but was intrigued by its association with Western Union and the bowstring truss.

Ms. Strong did not support nomination because it does not rise to any of the standards of a landmark.

Ms. Wirsching did not support nomination because it does not meet the criteria.

Ms. Howard said it does not rise to the level of landmark status and did not support nomination.

Mr. Luoma did not support nomination and while he thought its association with Western Union interesting, it was not significant.

Ms. Conti agreed with the Staff Report and said it doesn't rise to the level of landmark status and would not support nomination.

Mr. Hannum did not support nomination although he thought the connection to Western Union interesting.

Mr. Lee did not support nomination.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the 500 Dexter Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the Staff Report.

MM/SC/SS/VA

10:0:0 Motion carried.

100709.42

522-524 Dexter Avenue North

Sonia Sokol-Fürész provided context of the area and went over the development of the area over time. She explained the development of "auto row" in the 1920s and noted that after WWII the decline of residential and increase of manufacturing and warehouse uses. The construction of I-5 separated and further defined the area.

Ms. Sokol-Fürész reported that the building was constructed in 1928 for A. J. Eberharder. She explained the original permit described the use as "warehouse" and noted that there has been a variety of uses over time. The architect was William R. Grant and Ms. Sokol-Fürész showed other examples of his work noting the (landmarked) Naval Reserve Armory.

The building is sited mid-block, facing west along Dexter Avenue North. The primary façade is clad with wire-cut brick in various shades of brown, with cast stone details. The three-bay composition of the façade is emphasized by four pilasters topped with geometric cast stone "capitals" of a modest Art Deco flavor. Between the pilasters, a brick soldier course defines the lintels. The parapet is predominantly flat but steps up to a gable-shaped peak at the center bay, and below the peak is a cast stone cartouche. She went over the major changes to the store fronts and interior over time.

Ms. Sokol-Fürész reported that the building does not meet any of the criteria for nomination. In response to Board member questions she explained the transom windows were all covered by the 1950s.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hannum said the building has lost its significant integrity and he would not support nomination.

Ms. Conti did not support nomination because the building does not meet the initial threshold of landmark status.

Mr. Luoma did not support nomination noting there were too many significant alterations and that there wasn't a lot there to begin with.

Ms. Howard said that while she likes small buildings this one does not rise to the level of landmark status and she would not support nomination.

Ms. Wirsching agreed with the Staff Report and would not support nomination and said it would be questionable even as part of a district.

Ms. Strong did not support nomination noting there wasn't much there to begin and noted the many alterations.

Mr. Abelsen did not support nomination because of the lack of significant features or character defining elements.

Mr. Savage agreed with Mr. Abelsen and said it was a simple and utilitarian building that was insignificant.

Mr. Veith said the building did not meet any of the criteria noting it was not an outstanding design nor does it stand out in the neighborhood. He said the only feature that he would have considered is the façade and that has been altered. He did not support nomination saying it was "not even close".

Mr. Lee agreed with Mr. Veith and said the building does not rise to the significance.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the 522-524 Dexter Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the Staff Report.

MM/SC/MS/MW

10:00 Motion carried.

**100709.5 BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Chave reminded Board members of the upcoming Boards and Commissions reception.

**100709.6 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator