



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 210/10

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, June 16, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen, Chair  
Jerry Finrow  
Mark Hannum  
Christine Howard  
Patrick King  
Aaron Luoma  
Steve Savage  
Marie Strong  
Tom Veith, Vice Chair  
Meredith Wirsching

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Karen Gordon  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Elaine Wine

Chair Vern Abelsen called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

### **061610.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES** Meeting of May 19, 2010

#### 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"

MS/MW/TV/CH 9:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Ms. Howard abstained.

**061610.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION**

061610.21 Alaska Building  
618 Second Ave.  
(Pioneer Square Preservation District)

Karen Gordon provided information about the Special Tax Valuation program noting the work was done in conformance with a Certificate of Approval. The eligible rehabilitation costs were \$ 34,252,078.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: the Alaska Building at 618 Second Avenue, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based upon the recommendation of the Pioneer Square Preservation Board which made the following findings at its meeting of June 16, 2010, that the property is a contributing building located in the Pioneer Square Preservation District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the Pioneer Square Preservation District; and that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the District; and has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application, and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/TV/CH 8:0:2 Motion carried. Ms. Wirsching and Mr. Savage abstained.

**061610.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

061610.31 3518 S. Edmunds St.  
(Columbia City Landmark District)  
Proposed signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for installation of three building identification signs, consisting of the following: a) One (1) single-sided yard sign (dimensions 72”w x 32”h) attached to 4” x 4” wooden posts installed to the east of the south-facing entrance; b) One (1) double-sided yard sign (dimensions 32”w x 13”h) attached to 4”x4” wooden posts installed to the west of the south-facing entrance; and, c) One (1) door sign on the western entrance (dimensions 15” w x 5.19” h).

Ms. Frestedt said that all signs will feature vinyl decal lettering and logo on Dibond sign face. Exhibits included plans and photographs. She reported that

the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee reviewed the proposal for signage. She said the Committee recommended approval conditional on a couple of revisions some of which have been incorporated into the final proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Meredith Gallen, Southside Commons, explained that the space is used by non-profit organizations for a variety of programming and the signage will direct visitors to the correct door. She said that two yard signs are meant to “grab attention” from both directions on Edmonds. The east facing sign will be larger and the west facing sign will be much smaller. She said that the Columbia City Review Committee (CCRC) suggested including a border around the sign but they preferred the simplicity of no border.

Board Questions:

Responding to board questions Ms. Gallen explained that the 2<sup>nd</sup> sign is two-sided with a double panel. She explained that the sign is angled because of the way the landscaping is and how the previous sign was.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching noted that there was no negative impact on the building or the district, the sign was easily removable and the door sign will be on a non-historic door.

Mr. Abelsen said CCRC reviewed the application and recommended approval.

Mr. Veith recommended the submittal be adjusted to consistently show the size of the posts.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage at Southside Commons, 3518 S. Edmunds St. This action is based on the following:

The proposed signage meets the following sections of the District ordinance and 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 Landmark District Design Guidelines**

## Guidelines/Specific

**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 will 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. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

### Secretary of the Interior's Standards

**#9.** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

**#10.** New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/AL/CH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

061610.32 4743 Rainier Ave. S.  
(Columbia City Landmark District)  
Proposed signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed installation of an illuminated double-faced monument sign (dimensions: 11'w x 3'6" h on a 1'-3' high base). The sign will be constructed out of fabricated aluminum and feature neon channel lettering and a halo-lit logo. The proposal includes removal of the freestanding Columbia Plaza sign and installation of landscaping. Exhibits included drawings and photographs. She reported that the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for the proposed signage. She noted that the CCRC Guidelines do not include reference to lawn and yard signs and suggested consideration of Guideline # 11 and the

overall impact of the sign. She said the proposed sign is substantial but that given the configuration of the sign she noted the overall sign size is not problematic.

Steve Sampson, Heath Northwest Signs, explained they propose to remove the existing Columbia Plaza sign and replace it with neon tubing channel monument sign. He said that the logo will be illuminated with a subtle halo. The address numbers will be applied dimension letters. They will reuse the existing I-beam structure and footing.

#### Board Questions:

Ms. Wirsching asked if the CCRC talked about the internal illumination.

Mr. Hannum said that what is proposed is an improvement over what it there now and that there are no provisions in the Design Guidelines for this type of sign.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the guidelines do not support a typical interior lit sign, but said that the nature of this sign and the halo lit design of the sign are not reflective of what the Guidelines were trying to prohibit – for example, signs typical of strip malls, formula fast food etc. She said that halo lighting was approved on the Empire Espresso sign elsewhere in the district.

Mr. Sampson said it worked in the neighborhood and noted that each letter was individually lit. He said that double stroke neon will outline each letter and he directed board members to the detail in their packet. Responding to board questions he confirmed that it was not a back lit sign.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

#### Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching agreed that the sign is not what one would consider as internally lit and noted the applicant's effort to individually illuminate the letters.

Mr. Abelsen said it is reasonable and said that the sign is relatively large but in comparison to the site it fits well.

Mr. Veith said it is smaller than what it is replacing and will be less impactful to the district.

Mr. Hannum said that while it might not be appropriate elsewhere in the district, at this location, in front of modern buildings, it is okay.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage at Hasegawa Dentistry, located at 4743 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed signage meets the following sections of the District ordinance and 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 Landmark District Design Guidelines**  
**Guidelines/Specific**

**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 will 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. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

**g. Sign Lighting.** Sign lighting should be subdued and incandescent. Back-lit signs are prohibited. Signs that flash, blink, vary in intensity, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion shall not be permitted.

**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. If a Plexiglas backing is proposed, it shall be clear and colorless. Neon signs should be designed to reflect the unique nature of the use within the building. Mass-produced neon signs are strongly discouraged.

**Secretary of the Interior's Standards**

**#9.** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

**#10.** New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/MH/CH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

061610.33 Lyon Building  
607 Third Avenue  
Proposed rooftop telecommunications equipment

Ms. Sodt explained that ARC reviewed the application and the applicant had made suggested revisions. She provided photos for board review.

Steven Topp, Clearwire, explained the telecommunication facility they propose to place on top of the historic building and went over their efforts to hide the equipment with a design appropriate to the building. The proposed 10' shroud would hide the antenna but not the equipment cabinet and would look just like an extension above the rooftop.

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Sodt explained that this building was landmarked in 1996. She said that this type equipment is common on historic buildings this size especially in historic districts.

Ms. Chave noted the Liggett Building has rooftop communications equipment.

Mr. Topp explained that he thought the antenna alone would fade into the background more than it would with a shroud. He said that they would be 4' panel antennas and a couple 2' diameter microwave antennas. He said that the FRP material is transparent to radio frequencies and he added that it can be painted to match the existing penthouses which are rust-red. The antennas will be positioned at the center of the building to get the best coverage and to comply with City Code.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

There was discussion about whether or not a shroud was really necessary and if just the antennas themselves would be less obtrusive. Board members generally agreed that the preference was for no shroud.

Ms. Howard thanked the applicant for making the attempt to find a creative solution.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed rooftop telecommunications equipment with the condition that no FRP shroud shall be provided for the antennas, and the cabinet need not be painted on the Lyon Building at 607 Third Avenue, per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 118236 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/TV/MW 10:0:0 Motion carried.

061610.34 Old Georgetown City Hall Building  
6202 13<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.  
Proposed signage

Dan Leckman, Miller Hayashi Architects, explained that a change of name of the facility to “Neighborcare” necessitates a change in signage. He said that there are two existing signs on site and historically there was one more. He said they propose to replace the two signs and provide a third at the front of the building. He provided photos and drawing. He said that in-ground lighting will be used to illuminate the signs at night.

Board Questions:

Responding to clarifying questions, Mr. Leckman said that the two signs associated with the entry have decorative balls on top while the parking area sign does not. He said that the owner is comfortable with the text as it is. He said he verified that there is not a separate Georgetown City Hall sign on the building.

Mr. Leckman provided material samples and went over the proposed colors.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said that the signs are independent of the structure and don't affect landmarked materials; he said they are small so they don't interfere with building detail.

Ms. Wirsching commented that it was an elegant solution with the in-ground lighting.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed monument signs at the Old Georgetown City Hall at 6202 13<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #111302 because the proposed signage does not alter historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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/MS/JF            10:0:0 Motion carried.

061610.35    Wallingford Fire Police Station Building  
1629 N. 45<sup>th</sup> St.  
Proposed signage

Dan Leckman explained the proposed sign replacement and provided photos for Board review. He said the proposed new sign will salvage and reinstall the steel "45" and install it on a concrete plinth. He said the Neighborcare signage plaque will be attached to the top at the same location as existing and will be illuminated with in-ground lighting.

Board Questions:

Mr. Luoma asked if the orientation of the "45" will be the same.

Mr. Leckman said it would. Mr. Leckman went on to describe the sign – cream background with green lettering.

Mr. Veith asked if the client had any issue with the clash of these colors on a gray building that has pink trim.

Mr. Leckman noted he reviewed the colors with the client; the client did not plan any change of paint colors for the building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said that the change affects only a sign added to the site and will not affect any historic fabric. He said the sign is a little larger but it won't impact appreciation of the building.

Ms. Howard noted the proposed colors are more subdued than the existing sign.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed replacement of the sign base and associated site alterations at the Wallingford Fire and Police Station at 1629 N. 45<sup>th</sup> St., as per the applicant's submittal. This action is based on the following:

The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #111888 because the proposed replacement of the sign base and associated site alterations do not alter 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/JF/MS 10:0:0 Motion carried.

061610.36 Parker-Fersen House  
1409 E. Prospect St.  
Proposed re-roofing

Project architect Marvin Anderson provided context of the site noting it is on one of the highest points in Capitol Hill. He said the pitched roof is visible from the street and noted the flat roof and torch down porch roofs are in bad shape. He explained that there are five layers of asphalt – installed over 30 years – and that the original cedar shingles may be beneath. He said they proposed to install gray Carlisle Eco Star roofing on the pitched roof because of its aesthetic compatibility. He pointed out that the product is environmentally friendly and has a 50-year warranty. He said on the flat roofed portions of the house that the existing torch down is proposed to be replaced with TPO membrane which also was chosen for environmental friendliness. He said at the edges of the roof they will install Kynar painted white flashing to match existing. He said they intend to replace the existing corrugated rectilinear downspouts with plain round downspouts which will be painted white to match the house. He said where the crown moulding is rotted it will be replaced in-kind.

Ms. Chave explained that this project was reviewed by the ARC.  
Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the applicant found any evidence of the original downspouts.

Mr. Anderson said the original ones were plain round downspouts. He said originally the house was clad in beveled cedar siding and the stucco was applied in the 1940's. Responding to clarifying questions he said that the owners looked at 15 – 20 different roof products and what is proposed is their preference; they thought the gray would enhance the house.

Mr. Abelsen asked how they will do the transition from rectilinear to round downspouts at the connection to the gutter.

Mr. Anderson said the gutters were built-in and he was not sure what happens as they drop through the soffit because there is a lot of deterioration as the water goes through there. He explained they will fabricate a trough out of TPO clad stainless steel that lines the gutter and then round stainless steel drop welded on to it that goes all the way through the soffit and the downspout will sleeve over that on the understand. He explained that 40 tons of roofing material will be removed and there may be some minimal cracking as the house rises back up.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said that what is proposed seems reasonable and that the cedar shake has not been there for a long time so there is no need to bring it back.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed re-roofing of the Parker-Fersen house and its carriage house, at 1409 East Prospect Street, and associated repairs, as per the application submittal. This action is based on the following:

The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 113423 because the proposed alterations do not significantly alter 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/MW/CH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

**061610.4 DESIGNATION**

061610.41 Bloss House  
4055 SW Holgate St.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, introduced Megan Meulemans who co-authored the nomination report, and Larry Kreisman, Historic Seattle. She said that since the nomination at the April 21, 2010 meeting the house has changed ownership. Historic Seattle prepared the nomination at the request of owner Ruth Ward who passed away five days after the nomination was approved by the LPB; Ms. Woo said that Ms. Ward was thrilled to know it was nominated. She said the new owners are the next door neighbors, Michael and Andrea Ramage; she thanked them for opening the house for the Board tour.

Larry Kreisman, Program Director at Historic Seattle, and co-author of a book on the Arts and Crafts Movement, said he spent eight years serving on the Landmark Preservation Board. He noted his excitement doing the research. He said that Colin Barr – who lives in an Elmer Green house himself – did much research on the architect and that the house carries the theme of architects working in the northwest – Vancouver, Victoria, Seattle. He said the house is a well designed bungalow and is exemplary of the ideals of Arts and Crafts which are a celebration of craftsmanship and attention to detail and appreciation for sound construction, pleasing proportions, grace and simplicity. He said it would have been wonderful to look at all the bungalows in Seattle and to have prioritized and pulled the best of different types and to have designated the best. He said that it would be unrealistic to find ‘the best’ bungalow in Seattle because bungalows were geared to individual taste and were a smorgasbord of styles, and types of materials and mixes of built-ins and pointed out that in addition to the Bloss House’s buffet, cabinets, fireplace and it also had a built-in ironing board. He said that bungalows are more than just a house. He said that songs, poetry and treatises have been written about bungalows – bungalow is not a building type, it is a lifestyle that was part of a golden age. He read “Bungal-Ode” by Burgess Johnson, published in Good Housekeeping magazine in 1915, about the same time this bungalow was built:

There's a jingle in the jungle,  
'Neath the juniper and pine,  
They are mangling the tangle,  
Of the underbrush and vine,  
And my blood is all a-tingle  
At the sound of blow on blow,

As I count each single shingle  
On my bosky bungalow.

There's a jingle in the jungle,  
I am counting every nail,  
And my mind is bungaloated,  
Bungaloping down a trail;  
And I dream of every ingle  
Where I angle at my ease,  
Naught to set my nerves a-jingle,  
I may bungle all I please.

For I oft get bungalonly  
In the mingled human drove,  
And I long for bungaloafing  
In some bungalotus grove,  
In a cooling bung' location  
Where no troubling trails intrude,  
'Neath some bungalowly rooftree  
In east bungalongitude.

Oh, I think with bungaloathing  
Of the strangling social swim,  
Where they wrangle after bangles  
Or for some new-fangled whim;  
And I know by bungalologic  
That is all my bungalown  
That a little bungalotion  
Mendith every mortal moan!

Oh, a man that's bungalonging  
for the dingle and the loam  
Is a very bungalobster  
If he dangles on at home.  
Catch the bungalocomotive;  
If you cannot face the fee,  
Why, a bungalooan'll do it--  
You can borrow it of me!

Mr. Kreisman said the bungalow represented a huge development in the culture and a huge movement toward the middle class finding homes for themselves. He said that this bungalow epitomizes that struggle to find a place for oneself in our “frontier-land” here. He said that many have lost features that are integral to their design because of change of lifestyles and

expansion and ill-conceived additions. He said that what distinguishes the Bloss bungalow is the unique twin gable coordination which, he said, he had not seen in any bungalows in the area except this one. He said that mindful of the fact that bungalows have a lot of commonalities they are also extremely different from one another. He pointed out that this house is largely unaltered. He urged the board to designate the house to restore a balance to the tendency to focus on period revival style architecture at the loss of certain things that are common to the culture. He said this bungalow tells the tale of that is vastly more influential of changes in the way people lived as an American middle class culture began to form.

Ms. Woo focused on Criterion D and noted that she still does think it meets Criterion E noting that this is one of the least altered of all Green's houses. She said the house is in the Craftsman character and noted that Bungalow is a form and not a style and she provided photos showing examples pointing out characteristic elements. She said that it is rare to have the original drawings of a house of this scale and type as exist here. She said that a resource does not have to be the best or most perfect or unique example of an architectural style to meet Criterion D but it does have to "*embody the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or method of construction.*" She said the Bloss House embodies the Craftsman Style Bungalow and has a high degree of integrity. She noted that the interior woodwork is Douglas fir.

Ms. Woo provided examples of other City landmarks: the James Washington, Jr. home and studio in which some portions of the interior were designated; the Bowen Huston house, where a portion of the interior was designated; she also noted the Victorian and the Fisher Howell houses, Fitch Nutt House and the Egan House as houses that have been designated, some with interiors included. She noted commercial – not high style – buildings that have been landmarked – the Jensen Block and the Windham Apartments. She said they help to define Seattle and if not designated they may not be there today.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the upper level casement windows were a departure from what is typical and if so, would that be significant.

Ms. Woo said casement windows were used quite a bit and are period appropriate. While she wasn't sure if these are original she said they do not detract from the house.

Mr. Veith asked about changes to the kitchen and if there are any other character-defining features of the house that have been altered.

Ms. Woo said kitchen alterations include the floor, counter, and that some of the cupboards and cabinets have been painted. She said a lighting fixture in the front bedroom has been changed. She said the half story upstairs was finished early on as well as the bathroom which, she said, is significant on its own. She said the side door to the basement on the west façade was changed out. She said the fireplace surround brick might be different. She noted all the woodwork is original.

Ms. Wirsching asked how many other houses that were part of Green's pattern book still exist.

Ms. Woo said that Colin Barr has identified 10 – 12 and is still working on identifying more.

Ms. Wirsching asked about why the James Washington, Jr. House was designated.

Ms. Woo said because of its association with a significant person, James Washington, Jr. who was a significant artist. She said the artist's studio (on the property) was a William Bain designed building from the 1960s.

Ms. Chave said the studio was built in the '60s and designated under C and B primarily due to Dr. Washington's significance.

Ms. Woo pointed out that part of the interior was designated.

Ms. Chave said it was intact and that the Washingtons wanted it designated.

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Woo said the attic was finished in 1937.

Owner Comment:

Michael Ramage explained that he and his wife Andrea live next door in his grandfather's house and that they knew the previous owner, Ruth Ward. He said they had been talking to Ms. Ward about buying the house since 2005. He said they are committed to keeping their promise to Ms. Ward. He said that they love the house and want to bring it back to full functionality. He said there is a lot of deferred maintenance: the roof leaks, the chimney needs to be rebuilt, the floors need to be refinished and a rotted wood beam replaced; he said the house needs to be painted, walkways and the concrete stair need to be replaced. He said the knob and tube electrical needs to be replaced and the plumbing needs work as well. He said new kitchen appliances will be needed. He expressed concern about the amount of oversight that will be needed and he would like to work with staff on a reasonable proposal of work perhaps on an annual basis rather than having to

come to repeated meetings. He said they weren't sure if there would be a financial impact of having a landmarked property and that they were nervous about the process and what would be controlled. He said there is currently legal action against the Ward estate so their future ownership is not yet finalized; he suggested putting off Controls and Incentives negotiations until the ownership is finalized.

Responding to Board comment about the purchase and sale agreement and what the owner had intended Ms. Chave explained that what is in the purchase and sale agreement is not part of this process.

Mr. Ramage said Ms. Ward wanted the woodwork to remain unpainted. He reiterated his desire to consolidate the approval process to eliminate their need to repeatedly come back before the Board.

Ms. Chave explained that property owners often come in with a whole list of items but it is up to each property owner how they want to do it.

Mr. Veith said that Controls and Incentives is a way to specify what can be dealt with at a Staff level. He said it helps the owner and the Board.

Mr. Ramage commented that it was not their object to remove the Board from the process. He said they have discovered through discussions with Ms. Woo and Rick Sever that there are resources of which they can avail themselves that will be very helpful. He said he thinks this designation is do-able.

#### Public Comment:

Rick Sever, architectural historian and design-builder, remodel, restoration contractor, said that he has worked on this type house since 1983. He said he worked on a house three houses away from the Bloss House a couple years ago, grew up in West Seattle, and has never seen the house. He said he knows of only five M-style dormers like this house has. He noted that what is unique about this one is that the bargeboards meet at the corner and most M-style dormers are up the roof so are smaller within the roof plane. He said there are a lot of unique features and noted a carrying beam with a 3-step above the column on the front of the house along with the double M-style dormer. He said it is unique because you would normally have one or the other. He said if the dormers coming out to the face the beam would be enclosed but it is exposed beam. He said the house is a hodge podge of pieces which is the beauty of the style. He noted the intact kitchen with its flour bin and vegetable cupboards. He said that most houses do not have interior controls and when they are it should only be the public spaces that are designated. He said that he wouldn't want to cook in a 19-teen kitchen – as great as it is. He said they could use the form and work with it and add to it to make it work. He said the parts are so intact - the rafter tails where the gutters are – most of

these houses have cut them off and these are still notched. He said that all the pieces that people ask him to replace are on this house.

Mollie Tremaine, former LPB member, called the house a gem and that it was like stepping back in time. She said it is important to keep it. She noted the unrestored wood work in the public rooms stands out – the box beams are unique and she noted the wainscoting. She supported designating everything but she agreed with Mr. Sever that it isn't reasonable to do that because not many people would be able to live with an unimproved kitchen and bathroom. She said that most bungalows were not designed by architects but were from plan books; this one was designed by an architect. She noted the Seattle bungalow being sited on a knoll with retaining walls and a basement. She said that Ms. Ward presented this opportunity to designate a bungalow and it would be a shame not to designate it.

Henry Matthews, architectural historian, published on northwest architecture, taught courses on historic preservation, and former member of Landmarks Preservation Board, commented on the well-written nomination and said the house is an example that should absolutely be designated a landmark; he said he would support Criterion E as well as D noting the importance of looking at the significance of architects who are in the second tier. He said he endorsed Mr. Kreisman's comment that more ordinary buildings should be designated. He said the Bungalow is a particular Seattle type and is significant rather than period revival buildings – those that are aiming at high style - as opposed to more common types. He supported designation and said it is a tribute to the owners who resisted any temptation to temper with its integrity of the house; he said it is very rare for a bungalow to have this level of integrity. He said that if designated – the nomination form will be permanently archived and there is some very useful history that other people would want to consult in the future of the type of people who owned the Seattle house and about the history of the neighborhood. He supported designation including the public rooms in the house.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, submitted a letter of support and commented that the house was an example of the Craftsman Bungalow and had high integrity. She said it is significant of defining the style in the history of Seattle. She said there are so few Craftsman bungalows represented. She said the James Washington, Jr. house and the Betty Bowen house were nominated because the owners wanted it. She said it is time to designate a bungalow.

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, said the integrity is there and she said it is awesome and unusual to find one all intact. She noted how important it is that the heritage has remained and that it housed a family comfortably. She said the previous owner wanted designation and the new owners are supportive as well.

Brooke Best said she wrote a book on West Seattle architectural history. She said the Bloss House is one of the best examples; it is intact and represents the Craftsman style. She said that West Seattle is often overlooked – that it is not a high style community. She said this house is a wonderful example and that he would like to see more of its heritage recognized.

Mimi Sheridan, architectural historian, said the Ordinance plays a strong role in preserving the fabric of the City. She said it is vital that we nurture the single family owners who want to have their buildings designated. She noted the need to honor a good and intact house and that it is important to nourish in the community.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma fully supported designation noting it is a wonderful house. He supported keeping the public spaces designated. He agreed with the Staff Report and noted that Criterion D “*it embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, or period, or method of construction*”. He said it doesn’t say that it has to be significant in comparison to the City, State or Nation. He agreed that the site and building have a high level of integrity and the ability to convey its significance.

Ms. Howard supported designation and thanked the owners for the tour and for working collaboratively with the board. She said the house embodies the Craftsman style and is intact – including the kitchen. She said it is not appropriate to designate the kitchen but to designate the exterior and public interior spaces.

Ms. Wirsching said the type of house is common in the City and is not in danger of disappearing although many are being torn down. She said because it is a bungalow it is pretty common and any uniqueness is related to Green and what he contributed.

Mr. Hannum supported designation and said it is a wonderful building with lots of details. He said he was impressed that the owner nominated it and said it is a contributing part of the neighborhood. He said he couldn’t help but designate it and that Criterion D is appropriate.

Ms. Strong supported designation and thanked Historic Seattle and the new owners for agreeing to some of the things in the Purchase and Sale Agreement. She said that she had cautioned the Board at the nomination about the interior but after the tour she supported including the living and dining rooms because the house would attract someone looking for those very details and would increase the value to have those things intact. She thanked the new owners.

Mr. Finrow originally questioned it but said it definitely is worth designation based on Criterion D. He noted the commitment of the new owners and the sense of wanting a solid collaboration between the City and the owners to restore and give new life to the house. He said the idea of working out some arrangement that will work well is a good thing. He said this kind of collaboration provides a really good model for the community and he would like to see more of it. He said he would like to see interior public space be included. He said we do a lot of work with outstanding architecture and architecture as represented by the house reviewed in an earlier application (Parker-Fersen House) which is at the other scale of the economic pyramid in Seattle. He noted the need to have more working class housing and working class buildings represented in the City which, he said, makes the case for the average Seattleite. He said that is a very important part of this story that we have people of modest means building a house, living in it, maintaining it, respecting and understanding the value of its architectural qualities, loving it and keeping it intact over the years. He said it is a lesson well worth learning for the city. He supported designation and said it is a model for how to proceed noting it was a win-win.

Mr. Savage supported designation based on Criterion D and commended Ms. Woo and Mr. Kreisman's work on the nomination and presentation. He supported designation on Criterion D including the interior main floor minus the kitchen and bathroom. He said that the wood work and cabinetry and stairwells were equally important.

Mr. King said it was helpful to have seen the interior on the tour and that he agreed with Ms. Tremaine who called the house "a gem". He commented that this is not just another bungalow – it is "exceptional" and noted its integrity. He supported designation including the living and dining rooms.

Mr. Veith said the house is typical although better than average. He said it does have a high degree of integrity which one is unlikely to find as the City ages; many houses that have been carefully tended on the exterior will be heavily modified inside. He said D is the appropriate Criterion but he was leaning against supporting designation. He said that in its favor it does have the typical bungalow scheme but deals with it more thoughtfully than if picked out of a pattern book. He said it replaces the front hall/entry with porch where typical bungalows would put the porch out front. He noted peculiarities in detail and said it is a less than complete or an unusual example. He agreed that the living room and dining room should be controlled but not the kitchen.

Mr. Veith said a lot of bungalows painted the kitchens light colors and he questioned if the cabinets were stripped at some point. He suspected there was a chimney in the kitchen that has been removed. He noted the temptation

to include the whole main floor but said that the living room and dining room would suffice.

Mr. Abelsen said it meets the qualification for designation and asked Board members to clarify what should be included in designation. It was determined that just the living room and dining room be included in the motion. Mr. Abelsen said the house is a good example of the Craftsman bungalow and noted the owners have every intention of caring for even those elements not included in the designation.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Bloss House at 4055 SW Holgate St. 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 site, the exterior of the building, and the following elements of the interior: the living room and the dining room.

MM/SC/MS/CH 8:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Wirsching and Mr. Veith opposed.

**061610.5 NOMINATION**

061610.51 Lloyd Building  
601 Stewart Street

Ms. Sodt explained that the Lloyd Building is a Category 1 building in the Downtown Survey, and she introduced architectural historian Karin Link who prepared the nomination.

Ms. Link presented the nomination report (full report in DON file) and began by providing context of the site. 1923 maps projected a new larger downtown and “maximum height area” and she explained that the 10-story Lloyd Building – completed in 1926 - represents one of the first tall office buildings in the vicinity of the projected downtown core. She reported that the 120’ x 53’ concrete structure has continuous piers, six bays on the main north façade (Stewart St.) and three bays on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Ms. Link pointed out the proportions and organization of parts noting the Renaissance Revival inspired floral and leaf motif ornament at the base and top of the building. She said there is ornamental terracotta at the ground level and at the mezzanine and she pointed out the parapet and cornice detail. She stated that three storefronts are original and noted the angled glazing, plate glass and nice wood doors. She said the tile predates 1951 and the transoms were changed in 1951. She said that the 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue corner storefront has changed many times. She noted that vinyl replacement windows had been

installed in some instances. She said the east elevation is not meant to be seen from the street.

She said the architectural styles in Seattle are eclectic. She said that until the first decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century most buildings were three to four stories with masonry or concrete exterior walls and heavy timber post and beam construction with the exception of the Smith Tower which is steel framed. She said that using concrete post and beam was a new trend for Seattle.

She said the building meets Criterion D as an example of Beaux Arts Renaissance Revival style. She noted the organization of its constituent parts and the contrast of the terracotta and buff brick.

Ms. Link said that architect Victor Voorhees was a prolific Seattle architect doing most of his work between 1907 to the 1920s. Voorhees designed Georgetown City Hall, Washington Hall, the Troy Laundry, A.C. Goerig Warehouse, the Uptown Theater, the Vance Hotel, Joseph Vance Building, and Vance Building. She said the Lloyd Building includes the most elegant ornamentation detail and retains more detail. Ms. Link said that the building meets Criterion E because it is an outstanding example of Voorhees's work.

Ms. Link said that Joseph Vance had early success in the lumber industry and Vance Lumber commissioned the Lloyd Building. By 1930s they had one of the largest business real estate portfolios in Seattle; their holdings included the Vance Hotel, Vance Building, and the Camlin Hotel. She stated that Vance Lumber was one of the largest lumber enterprises in the Pacific Northwest; health issues prompted Vance's move to Seattle and he became involved in real estate. Vance's investments in valuable property made him one of the largest owners of downtown business properties in the City. Ms. Link went over Vance's expansive holdings and said that the firm was worth \$72 million in 1985. She said that Vance was one of Seattle's major figures and that he leveraged the success of the Vance Lumber Company; he was one of the leaders in the development of the Westlake area. She said that the building meets Criterion B because of its association with Vance.

She said tenants of the building represented a variety of offices and that the building was fully occupied from the 1930s through the 1960s. She said the building meets Criterion C due to its development as part of Vance's real estate portfolio and successful investments.

She said the building is visible from many directions and that it stands out visually in the neighborhood and contributes to it so meets Criterion F. She said the building is well worth nominating.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked why this building was a Category 1 building.

Ms. Sodt explained that it was part of the Downtown Survey; Category 1 and 2 buildings were thought likely to be eligible for designation so nominations were written. She said the determination by the consultant and city staff was based in part on known significance, architectural integrity, and the building style.

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Link explained that more windows were replaced on the west elevation. She said that Joseph Vance commissioned the building and that Joseph and Lloyd Vance both had offices in the building. She said the building housed the headquarters from 1943-44.

Mr. Veith noted the 1923 zoning and the anticipation of expanded business core and asked if Ms. Link would associate the building with the national trend toward setback rules in late teens and early 1920s and if the owner and designer limited heights in order to avoid having to do a setback.

Ms. Link said she thought yes.

Ms. Wirsching said the Medical Dental Building has 16 stories in the main body and the tower has 18 stories and has no setbacks on the building and it was built prior to the Lloyd Building.

Mr. Veith said that on two sides veneer was added to the concrete shell and on the remainder of the east elevation and the south elevation is the concrete and the upper floor step back. He asked if space was left on the south side as a light well.

Ms. Link said that she suspected that the south elevation was expected to work as a light well.

Mr. Veith said that it has been suggested that a Seattle practice was to use concrete framing and noted that this contrast of Seattle to other cities where steel framing was more popular. He said it was strange that Seattle used concrete frames in an earthquake zone. He asked if the choice of frame guided the characterizations of facades and the execution of veneers.

Ms. Link said that yes and added that the fact that they were using concrete on interior – in Seattle that wasn't done as much and often had heavy timber kinds of interiors still.

Mr. Veith said that timber frame with masonry exterior wall was often called "standard construction" and that going above three to four stories necessitated going to concrete or steel. He asked when the marquee was removed.

Ms. Link said there was a little more comfort with using this material so even a 10-story building isn't a big deal now but then there was a little more comfort so they could do it and the zoning code encouraged it. She said the marquee was removed in the 1950s.

Mr. Veith asked if the incised V's in the terracotta were specifically designed or if they were chosen from a catalog.

Ms. Link wasn't sure.

Mr. Finrow noted that McGraw Square is one block away. He said that there is not a lot of historic fabric left in this area and that this building is an important piece of urban fabric calling it a "key lynch pin for this whole area" because it is an important historic building for a lot of reasons.

Mr. Abelsen asked that in addition to how visible the building is Ms. Link elaborate on how she sees the context in light of Mr. Finrow's comments.

Ms. Link noted the most important context is its visibility around the public square. She said that there is the subject building and behind it the 1925 Fox Garage, the Medical Dental Building, and the Times Square building. She said that it is too bad the Orpheum Theater no longer exists.

Mr. Abelsen asked what came first, what were the influences and as Mr. Finrow pointed out there is not much historic fabric that remains. He said the urban context is important and he noted that Criterion F may be a possibility.

Ms. Link said the area later became the most trafficked area in the City; the Lloyd Building preceded that so there was some anticipation of what was to come. Even though there was a zoning plan – which was rather ambitious – a lot of wasn't built. She said the Lloyd Building was early which is why it is probably a transition building in the terms of style.

Jack McCullough, representing the owners, introduced Rob Mawson and John Tess of Heritage Consulting, who would present on behalf of the owners. He said they worked on the Hotel Max (Vance Hotel) nomination where the board decided not to nominate it. He said the Hotel Max is virtually identical to the Lloyd Building.

Mr. Mawson said the Lloyd is best understood as a Commercial style building and when it was constructed it was a conservative investment project that did not compete with higher end buildings. He said it was utilitarian, built on a small parcel, of modest height and oriented to the lesser street. He said it was a typical commercial design of applied terracotta ornamentation which, he said, was very nice but not 3-dimensional. He said the interior is utilitarian and one of 350 office buildings in 1926 and is similar in design to the Vance

Hotel. He said the building has seen significant changes over time – the lobby and main entry. He noted the relatively low floor to floor heights.

Mr. Mawson said the Vance Lumber Company established an office in Seattle in 1921 and first built a warehouse in Seattle in 1924, also designed by Victor Voorhees. They began doing real estate investment and development in 1926 and its last development project in 1929. He said at the time the Joseph Vance Building was completed he said there were only four Vance Lumber development projects and four investment properties.

Mr. Mawson said that Voorhees had no academic or apprenticeship training. He said Voorhees was very prolific and largely known as a residential designer and apartment buildings. He said Voorhees designed the building for Vance Lumber and that his last project in Seattle was for Vance.

He said that reinforced concrete construction was common in Seattle in the 1910s, 1920s and 1930s and cited the Cobb and Exchange Buildings as better examples. He said the commercial style building is a pragmatic, functional and a common urban design seen in every city: buildings are built to the lot lines, flat brick facades, flat roofs, often tripartite organization with ground floor retail, often applied ornamentation and terracotta or cast stone. He said a Seattle database shows over 1000 buildings in this style and this building is not exemplary of this style. He said during this time the Alaska, Joshua Green, Central buildings were built. He said changes to the main entry, storefronts and windows have been made and there is no architectural cohesion there anymore.

He went over the 1923 maximum height zone and said the Lloyd Building could have been 200' but is just 110' tall. He said the building does not meet landmark criteria.

He went over Ms. Link's nomination report and said he disagreed with her findings. He said the report doesn't show why the building is important to Seattle; he said it is not a first rate building. He said that there is nothing in the record that says it has value. He said the storefronts, entry and windows have been changed so the building lacks integrity. He said that there is no documented association with its role in Vance Lumber. He said that Vance was a building developer for Vance Lumber and it was not important because they only built four buildings. He said there is no record that identifies Joseph Vance as significant. He said that the building is a comparatively small speculative office building developed as an investment. He said the building does not qualify under Criterion B. He said the building was a typical modest project. He said there was no appreciable impact on Seattle and no significant association with the real estate market. He said the building does not meet Criterion C.

Mr. Mawson said the building does not meet Criterion D because in the survey it is identified as “Commercial – Chicago School – Beaux Arts”. He said the specifics of the style were not gone through and alterations limit the building as an example of a style. He said there is no definition of style or how the building expresses the style. He said there is no history on concrete construction, noting the Arctic or Exchange Buildings are better examples. Mr. Mawson said that Ms. Link did not provide comparative analysis of Voorhees’s body of work and that he was already in the National Register with the Georgetown City Hall. He said Voorhees was prolific in buildings like Washington Arms, Adams Apartments and Maximillien Apartments. He said the building opened to a lesser street and was a competent but not exemplary work so it did not meet Criterion E. He said Voorhees is better represented by other work.

Mr. Mawson said the building did not meet Criterion F because there was no evaluation of visual or spatial prominence. He said the building was never a visual landmark and blends in with the street wall. He said there is only one vantage point for the building. He said there are 74 different buildings in the neighborhood.

Jack McCullough said the building doesn’t meet any of the criteria and asked that the board not approve the nomination.

#### Board Questions:

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Mawson said that the typical floor to floor height today is 12’ – 13’ and is 10’ in the Lloyd Building. He said the building is Commercial style and is close to being "textbook". He said it was built to the lot line, with flat façade, flat roof, tripartite organization. He said it is a functional style which doesn’t have a lot of large windows; he called it a pragmatic, functional business-oriented building. He said the Vance Hotel is different stylistically based on the different terracotta.

Mr. McCullough said that the Vance Building is utilitarian – “a box with applied ornamentation”.

Mr. Mawson said that all the windows on the west façade are vinyl and 2/3 of the windows on the east façade are vinyl as are 1/3 of the windows on the north façade.

Mr. Finrow noted that what was put in replaces the double hung windows but that the window pattern was not changed.

Mr. Mawson concurred. He said it is a little bit heavier but it is still a one over one.

Mr. King asked Mr. Mawson if the Vance Hotel was considered an outstanding work of Voorhees because the title on the Mr. Mawson's presentation slide indicates that it is.

Mr. Mawson said he was just providing examples of Voorhees's work. He said it isn't their responsibility to identify what is necessarily a great work by Victor Voorhees.

Ms. McCullough stated that the title on the slide "Outstanding Work" is intended to characterize what Category E means.

Mr. Tess said they are not trying to equate value to how significant any of the buildings are.

Mr. King said he wasn't sure if some of the buildings shown were being contended as outstanding works.

Mr. Mawson contended that the Washington Arms is a nicely executed property. He said he didn't know enough of Voorhees's residential properties but his reputation is very solid in that area. He said that in terms of massing and scale the Joseph Vance Building was his largest project.

Mr. McCullough said that the Troy Laundry and the Georgetown City Hall are two examples of buildings that have been landmarked.

Mr. Finrow noted that the Vance Hotel (now the Hotel Max) and the Lloyd Building were opposite one another and that they were working together to form a greater whole.

Mr. Mawson said he could see the speculation but if there was speculation something happened in 1926 that stopped them from doing anything more.

Mr. Finrow clarified that they were opposite from one another – slightly askew with roughly the same plane or quality and form an urbanistic pair down Stewart Street. He said that right at the end where you have a breaking out into Westlake Mall and to the McGraw Plaza it is a pretty significant spot in the City.

Mr. Mawson said that he didn't think he thought...

Mr. Finrow said he wasn't asking for his thoughts, he said he was asking—is this area significant in terms of urban design—does it do it?

Mr. Mawson said he guessed that he could only give...

Mr. Finrow reiterated his question "does it do it".

Mr. Mawson said that well...

Mr. Finrow asked if in Mr. Mawson's opinion does it do it.

Mr. Mawson said no one has ever put it forward in City planning documents.

Mr. Finrow said that he is putting it forward now.

Mr. Mawson questioned if the intersection was important and said that yes, it was, with the streetcar coming in there, with the Medical Dental Building and the Westin Hotel and just by virtue of having cross streets meeting with an angled street you have a design opportunity. He questioned if it is the most important intersection in the City and is it more important than...

Mr. Finrow said he is not asking that question but that he is asking the question about these two buildings working together in an urbanistic sense even though they may not individually be the best examples of what you can do with commercial architecture but taken as a whole entity in that critical location in the City – which is a critical location.

Mr. Mawson said that if there was a design plan that would eliminate the street trees because frankly the street trees...

Mr. Finrow said he disagreed and said he goes down Stewart Street frequently on the bus and the street trees are very important and the buildings behind help make that street. And it comes down to the opening, urbanistically in the center of downtown Seattle in a key location. He said that both of the buildings work together in a pretty remarkable urbanistic way.

Mr. McCullough said if that is the case then nine months ago the board made a decision that the Hotel Max – the Vance Hotel...

Mr. Finrow said he understood that but that the two buildings work together and do some important things urbanistically under Criterion F and he said that is of significant value to the City.

Mr. Tess said that while those buildings do that there, but do those do it overwhelmingly over and above if you were to do something else in that area or build something else would it not accomplish the same thing; he said he thought that you could accomplish the same thing with another building.

Mr. Finrow said he disagreed and that most of the urban fabric around there has been eroded and these are two very important buildings, very similarly designed that contribute to an historic streetscape in that area and that a really

important part of this building is its contribution to the whole of that urban environment.

Mr. Abelsen commented that Mr. Mawson's report emphasized that the Lloyd Building is a commercial style but said he suggested that it was a commercial type and then the style is what is applied to it whether you agree or not with that. He asked why use they used style in association with "commercial".

Mr. Mawson said it is hard to do that in absence of anything else but using Beaux Arts which tends to be more three-dimensional, it tends to not have blockish massing and it often has a monumental entry, and significant 3-d ornamentation. He said the Lloyd Building in a Commercial Style is not that different from the Joseph Vance Building except that with the Joseph Vance Building you have some treatments at the roof line, decoration. He said the Joseph Vance Building is not a particularly great example of Art Deco. But it really depends on how community defines its style and he said he could see an argument where you take 1000 commercial style buildings that are identified in landmarks and define it – he said it needs to be articulated.

Mr. Abelsen asked Mr. Mawson if he would agree that, with any commercial building of a scale that reaches to ten stories or higher, all ornament is applied.

Mr. Mawson said no but that if you are looking at office buildings – yes, but if you look at the Exchange Building and you have massing that articulates the building and the Northern Life Building, the Baltimore Trust Building is clearly a Beaux Arts style building and went on to describe the details that make it so.

Mr. McCullough cited the Olympic Tower at 2<sup>nd</sup> and Pine as a more nearby example and said it is 12-13 stories with the setbacks up above and the three dimensional built in to the structure.

Mr. Mawson cited the Cobb Building noting its stronger 3-dimensional articulation and stronger use of a monumental entry way. He said the Lloyd Building is Commercial with Beaux Arts but it is not distinctive of a specific style.

Mr. Finrow said the notion of a building being an illustration of a type is an interesting one in this case. He said this particular building – as stated in Mr. Mawson's analysis – is a kind of generic building. He said that it is also a controlled expression of that idea – of a commercial building, a common building as with the earlier nominated Bloss House, a Beaux Arts building, a Craftsman style building that was fairly representative of modesty and of a kind of frugality and simplicity. He questioned if the same argument could be made for the Lloyd Building, that it is a common frugal typical office block in the City of Seattle that was part of urban fabric which makes a significant

contribution to the urbanistic qualities of this place but also is illustrative of this simple type of office building, modesty, not exuberant, not extravagant but extremely typical and he questioned if that was worth something.

Mr. Tess said you could make any argument you want in terms of architectural styles. He said they go before boards all the time and it is one of the most heated things you do. He asked if there are 1000 buildings in the inventory that are attributable to a particular style does that mean that you would designate every single one because you think many are good examples? He said it is the same argument that was made earlier with the bungalow and that there are a lot of bungalows. He asked if you make the argument in every sense and he said the argument that they.

Mr. Finrow interjected that its location in the City is important, as opposed to all of the others whose location may not be.

Mr. McCullough said he has heard that pitch before and the board has had to struggle with it before and to what degree within the Ordinance and the criteria can you elevate this sense of modesty. He said it was just done with the Bloss House and noted anything can be done if the board can get a majority. He said the board has typically – and the Bloss House is an exception - held to higher standards.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. King commented that he was “on the fence” – it was not an extraordinarily clear landmark. He said he that he is leaning toward D – because it does seem to have style or period and noted that was not discussed as much as style.

Mr. Savage said he understood the comparison between the Bloss House and a commercial downtown building and said they are on opposite ends of the spectrum. He said he will not support nomination and said that it is a subservient building and there are lots of other good examples throughout downtown. He said it falls short and said it is neither distinctive nor exemplary nor is it a specific landmark.

Mr. Veith said it was interesting to see the comments about the company – Vance Hotel and the Lloyd Building. He said he voted against nomination of the Vance Hotel stating that it just does what it has to do to be there. He said it doesn't have a strong character and what character it does have doesn't follow through on its concept. He said the major piers at street level don't work well with the middle and the top is a simple design. He said the Lloyd Building is a different animal – the designer has taken a position and it has

executed the style throughout the structure. He said that unlike the Vance Hotel, the Lloyd Building stresses the vertical element and is somewhat Sullivanesque in the articulation of the masonry to take you visually up the structure. He noted the six bays at the base facing Stewart with three that are close to original conditions with the exception of a change in the transom window. He said that even with the changes the basic concept is respected. He suggested considering Criterion D as the primary criterion. He said the Criterion E was not strong but compared to the Vance Hotel, which does not have a very strong concept and doesn't follow through on what concept it has, with the Lloyd Building we get some idea to Voorhees's ability to follow through on a concept. He said the buildings are quite distinct and although he wouldn't take Criterion E as the one of choice.

Regarding Criterion F he commented that you travel through a bunch of low-rise mixed style buildings until you get to this block where you have the Vance Building on one side and the Lloyd Building on the other and you pass through a little "gate" where you are no longer in the lower reaches of Capital Hill, you are actually coming into downtown and that happens at this block. He said that character has changed a little over the years because of the larger buildings that have appeared to the east of that block but you still get that sense because there are low-rise buildings for several blocks before you get to it. He said he was not sure he would put in F. He noted the urbanistic gesture to the City. He said no to A, B, C, but maybe D, E, F and that the building is worth considering.

Mr. Finrow agreed with Mr. Veith with regard to A, B, and C. He agreed with Mr. Veith regarding D and said it is a very elegant building and one of Voorhees's best commercial buildings. He said the building meets Criterion F noting that the fact that the area in which this pair of buildings is located and the sense of quality that is developing there is a much more important issue in a way than the architectural significance individually of the quality of the buildings although he said he thought the building is a very high quality building and said he supported nomination.

Ms. Strong said that Messrs. Veith and Finrow made an interesting point about the context of the building in the neighborhood but that the building did not rise to the level of a landmark and she did not support nomination.

Mr. Hannum supported nomination. He echoed comments made by Messrs. Veith and Finrow. He said the building faces Stewart Street, and would make an argument that since the Vance Hotel and Lloyd Building are of the same time and the same architect and the same developer they were trying to make some continuity in that area in making it more of a gateway. He said it is worthy to go forward in the process.

Ms. Wirsching said she agreed with Mr. Hannum hesitantly – and while she wasn't sure the building was worthy she wanted to hear more. She supported Criterion D. The building is not considered a high architecture style building but it has qualities that make it better executed than the Vance Hotel.

Ms. Howard said she agreed with Messrs. Veith and Finrow regarding Criterion D but that she did not support nomination because of the loss of integrity – the loss of detailing around the entry and the loss of windows.

Mr. Luoma commented on the interesting discussion about spatial location and said that when you look at Westlake Square where, he said, historically there used to be an underground comfort station. He said when you look at the ornamentation of the building as it faces 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue there seems to be a direct response to that urban space knowing it would be undevelopable as a small triangle. Because it responds to pedestrian scale – the store front is critical as it interacts with the pedestrian space. The storefront has lost a lot of integrity. He said that while it is better than the Vance Hotel, he would not support nomination due to loss of integrity.

Mr. Abelsen said he had similar concerns with integrity. He said the loss of the storefronts was unfortunate and it would be nice to have but it is not so significant. He said that what is significant is what remains: the building construction, the exterior cladding, the detailing and how it's formed. He recognized Mr. Tess's comment regarding siting that if another building was there would it still achieve the same thing. He said that while it might be true that this building is there and does play a significant role and he said if it is nominated he encouraged the applicant to explore that and to see what greater significance can be applied to that. He said regarding Criterion B he said it is a hard sell because simply owning property doesn't constitute validity of meeting that category.

Mr. Veith asked the presenter for more information on the Chicago style versus Commercial style because some say they are identical. He said that with regard to the marquee versus the shaft, it is the shaft that tells the story and not the marquee. He said that regarding the storefront changes they were designed to be changed and noted that three bays are close to original from the black tile base to the thin metal framing, plate glass windows and recessed doorway. (Commenting on the board's earlier designation of the Bloss House) he said that after designating a representative of a common house form we might also save a representative of a common storefront form.

Action: I move approval of the Lloyd Building at 601 Stewart Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for August 4, 2010; that this

action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/JF/TV          6:4:0   Motion carried. Messrs. Luoma, Savage,  
Mmes. Howard and Strong opposed.

**061610.6      BOARD BUSINESS**

**061610.7      STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator