



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 202/10

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, June 2, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

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

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Elaine Wine  
Patrick King  
Alyce Conti  
Jerry Finrow

Chair Vern Abelsen called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.

### **060210.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meeting of May 5, 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"

MM/SC/CH/MS 6:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Wirsching abstained.

**060210.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

060210.21 Ellsworth Storey House  
270 Dorffel Dr. E.  
Proposed re-roofing

Ms. Chave described the project and said that ARC had requested additional photos.

*Mr. Hannum arrived at 3:34 p.m.*

Applicant Comment:

Steve Scott, Manos Construction, provided material samples for board review and noted the greenish gray is the preferred valley metal flashing color.

Ms. Chave commented that John Manos, Manos Construction, had emailed photos that responded to ARC's request.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if there is valley flashing is on the existing neighboring house.

Mr. Scott said it was only on the chimney on the northwest corner area. He said the re-roofing and repair work would have no change to the overall structure.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said the most appropriate approach is to match existing and said that both were non-original. She preferred the gray flashing.

Messrs. Veith, Luoma and Savage preferred the valley metal # 1 color (the gray) for the flashing.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed re-roofing at the Ellsworth Storey House at 270 Dorffel Dr. E., with valley metal flashing color #1 This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 106071 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/AL/CH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

060210.22 Victorian Group Houses  
2006-2010 14<sup>th</sup> Ave. W.  
Proposed freestanding plaque

Ms. Chave explained the proposed free-standing plaque requested by the owner of two of the houses. She said it would be on a stake next to the stairwell between the two houses and added that it would not affect historic fabric.

Responding to board questions the owner's representative explained that the stake would be deep enough to hold the bronze plaque per the manufacturer specifications. She provided a photo of the proposed plaque.

Mr. Veith suggested alternate language that would be clearer about when the houses became a landmark and when they were built.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Chave explained the City no longer has a standard for plaques and noted that Queen Ann Historical Society has their own design.

Mr. Veith said the plaque is not attached to historic fabric and is easily removable. He said it is visually not imposing and won't affect the character of the structure.

Ms. Howard commented that it was great the owner wants to do this.

Mr. Luoma said he had no concerns.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed freestanding plaque at 2006 14<sup>th</sup> Ave. W. This action is based on the following:

2. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 108211 because the proposed plaque do 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/MH/CH      8:0:0    Motion carried.

060210.23      Old John Hay School  
2100 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. N.

Proposed exterior signage, handicap access ramp, removal of portion of the chimney of the 1922 Building, and paint color for windows of the 1922 Building.

Susan Fore explained the planned renovation and explained that an existing ramp will be re-graded to make it ADA accessible keeping the concrete walls and redoing the asphalt and pipe rail. She said playground will receive an overlay to refresh the asphalt with some areas being grinded and then overlaid, some areas receiving complete repair and other areas just being refreshed with a new coat of asphalt. All areas will be restriped. She explained that the school will become an elementary school and a play area will be added as well as a basketball court on the north side of the building.

Ms. Fore said that an ADA ramp will be attached to the gym portable building; the ramp will be manufactured by the company that provides the portable buildings. She said there are two existing stairs at the wood building one of which will be taken out and replaced with an ADA ramp.

Ms. Fore said the building had been painted 4-5 years ago and that where an existing concrete wall will be more exposed they will patch it up and will paint it to match existing. She explained the monumental signs identifying the wood and brick buildings noting that the new name of the school is "Queen Anne Elementary"; the existing sign at the wood building will be left in place and a metal plate added. The font of the metal plate will match the font on the "John Hay" sign. The existing sign in front of the brick building will remain and a separate new cast stone sign will be added in front. The new sign will be reminiscent of the existing sign and will match the relief profile.

Ms. Fore went on to explain that the windows and doors of the brick buildings will be painted with a paint that has been color-matched to existing although it

is still a little lighter. She said they are going back to the original scale profile look of the building.

Ms. Fore explained they will remove a portion of the existing brick chimney – about 7’ of it – but that it is barely visible from the front because the school was built 6 – 8’ above site. It will be visible from the back.

Responding to board questions Ms. Fore explained that school has started in the brick building and that the wood building will be empty for a while. She said that the wood building does not have the visibility that the brick one does and she hoped the new sign will be helpful. She said they had hoped to add the ADA ramp to the main entry stairs but said they had created a new corridor to the elevator when coming into the building so that everyone will end up at the same spot. She said they have added interior wayfinding signage.

Mr. Savage asked from where the 17’ chimney measurement had been taken and if the cap would have any ornamentation.

Ms. Fore said it was from the top of the existing roof. She said the chimney cap will match existing ornamentation.

#### Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, commented that the team had been responsive to their concerns. She said the chimney height is not a real issue and that she approves of the proposed work.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma asked about paint color on the doors.

Ms. Fore explained they will be painted the same as the window frames.

Ms. Wirsching commended the team for the location of the ramp on the wood framed building noting it was a low key location and will not be as obtrusive to the main entry.

Mr. Abelsen noted the clarification on the chimney height measurement.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the following work at Old John Hay School at 2100 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. N. /411 Boston Street: proposed exterior signage, handicap access ramps, removal of a portion of the chimney of the 1922 Building including amendment to designate the height of the chimney to be removed as well as replacing in kind the existing concrete cap, paint color for windows of the

1922 Building, door paint colors as noted, and playground re-surfacing, as per the submitted plans. This action is based on the following:

3. The proposed work does not adversely affect the designated features or characteristics 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/SS/AL 8:0:0 Motion carried.

### **060210.3 NOMINATIONS**

#### **060210.31 Pacific Science Center 200 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. N.**

Bryce Seidl, President and CEO of the Pacific Science Center, expressed support for its nomination noting that in 2012 it will be 50 years old. He explained that the Pacific Science Center (PSC) was born out of the World's Fair and focused on the importance of science. He spoke of the balancing the need to adapt to reflect a changing society and programmatic needs with the cherished historical and cultural attributes of PSC.

Ms. Howard explained that her immediate supervisor is on the board of the PSC and that she has access to internal communications. She said that she has no financial interests but offered to recuse herself if the applicant had any discomfort.

Mr. Seidl said it was not an issue to him.

There was no objection to Ms. Howard's participation.

David Peterson, Nicholson Kovalchick, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site which he said it on a separate parcel from Seattle Center. He said the building was commissioned in 1959 and finished in 1962. The architect was Minori Yamasaki, structural engineer, John Christensen and the local architect, NBBJ. He explained PSC was constructed to hold the largest science exhibit held by the federal government at that time and noted it was a crucial component of the World's Fair. He explained that attendees would follow a story line moving through the six buildings in sequence.

Mr. Peterson said that at the time PSC was the largest use of precast and prestressed concrete in the country. It was cast off-site in molds in a two-step process where the middle was strong concrete with the outside a quartzite shiny reflective surface. He pointed out the arch motif throughout. He said the ribs don't work – the center rib performs a stiffening element. He pointed out the shadow and light affects across the face of the buildings. He said the decorative ribs are load bearing elements which tell the direction of the spans of the roof beams and allow for clear span space for an exhibit hall. The scallop affect is not load bearing and not in the direction of weight. He pointed out that it was a nice touch for Yamasaki to differentiate the walls in this way.

Mr. Peterson presented information on each building noting that the numbering of the buildings is reversed from what it was originally:

Building 5 (originally Building 1) “Theater”: Mr. Peterson went over the curved wall of screens noting that the curved paneling and curve of the soffit remain. He said that bleachers were added and the back wall altered and the screen was replaced. He pointed out the exposed ceilings.

Building 4 (originally Building 2) “Theater/Lecture Hall”: Mr. Peterson went over the history of use for science experiments and said artificial floors are used to allow for conduit, wiring, etc. He said the building is still used for exhibits.

Building Laser Dome (originally Building 3) “Laser Dome”: Mr. Peterson said the 78' diameter screen was for a time the largest projector screen in the world. He said the “Boeing Spacearium” was the first large format immersion theater. He said the dome is original. He said that some say the dome was built by Buckminster Fuller but that there is no contemporary reference to his participation. Mr. Peterson said the dome was constructed in a warehouse in California and then trucked up and reconstructed. He said that the floor and seating have been replaced.

Building 3 (originally R) “Rest Building”: Mr. Peterson said this was the Junior Lab of Science. He said renovations were made in 1993 to the interior and exterior: the large bay window was added, the museum shop, entry on Denney and drop-off island were all added. He pointed out the two terraces with pebble retaining walls and noted that the balcony railing in front of the glass bay is original.

Building 2 (originally 4): Mr. Peterson said that this building was the largest for exhibits and noted the enormous clear span space. He said the planetarium was built in 1977. He said the doors were plain and unassuming. He pointed out the space was used for interactive exhibits.

Building 1 (originally Building 5): Mr. Peterson pointed out that the giant turntable still exists under the floor. He pointed out the people entered at the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and exited on the ground floor. He said the mezzanine level is original.

Mr. Peterson said that under the buildings are areaways for utilities and pointed out the punch-outs of lightweight concrete that could be used for HVAC changes and then filled back up as needed.

Mr. Peterson said that the Courtyard is the heart of the facility and provided a reflective, meditative space. He said the “petaled” fountains were custom-designed. The entry towers are an iconic landmark for the facility. Originally one tower had been planned and five 100’ towers were constructed perhaps in competition with the Space Needle.

Mr. Peterson pointed out artwork throughout the site, planters, and benches and also noted paving patterns.

Mr. Peterson said that there has been some deferred maintenance and some issues with weathering and noted settling problems with the pools and the difficulty of keeping them clean. He said the east and west exhibit gardens were displaced by the IMAX Theater and Discovery Labs. He said the gardens were modernist gardens with paths and berms and that Yamasaki designed everything.

He went over Mr. Yamasaki’s background noting that he was born in Seattle and attended the University of Washington Architectural School. Mr. Peterson provided photos of other buildings designed by Yamasaki: Oberlin College of Music, McGregor Center, and the World Trade Center as well as local examples - the Rainier Tower and the IBM Building. Mr. Peterson noted that Yamasaki designed the PSC early in his career.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wirsching asked the date of the alteration of the courtyard layout.

Mr. Peterson said it was in 1993.

Ms. Wirsching asked whether the original walls still existed where the two major additions were done.

Mr. Peterson said at the Discovery Lab location part of the wall is original and part of the wall was removed and a short return wall which was not originally there but was reused. The designers at the time tried to be sensitive to the existing fabric as possible so rather than demolishing elements they built up against them.

Mr. Luoma asked about exterior lighting.

Mr. Peterson didn't know.

Mr. Luoma asked about the inspiration for the arches and the forms they took.

Mr. Peterson said he wasn't sure but that each platform is 40' x 40' and that module is repeated throughout the design. He said when you see it in plan it is a delicate dance of shifting 20' and offsetting so that you create a way of pulling people to the right to the enormous opening porch.

Mr. Luoma asked about what still exists of the Halpern and Yamasaki gardens beyond the pebble retaining walls and how significant the pebble retaining walls were in their relation to the gardens.

Mr. Peterson said there are the retaining walls and the pebble fence. He said they were functional and significant. He said they are remnants of what used to be there. He said it is not the same original quiet, contemplative oasis but the elements are there.

Public Comment:

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, spoke in support of the nomination and said the ambience of the whole complex is still there. She said the complex was one of the first "hands on" science centers. She agreed with the Staff Report but suggested adding Criterion B.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, spoke in support of nomination noting it had been on the QAHS list of important properties.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle and DoCoMoMo thanked PSC for submitting the nomination and said she appreciated the community outreach. She said that DoCoMoMo interviewed Jack Christensen and said she would make the segment available on their website. She noted the importance of the structural engineer to this complex. She said the Yamasaki firm closed earlier this year and that all of the drawings were saved.

Chris Moore, Washington Trust, spoke in support of nomination noting the team of Yamasaki, Halpern and Christensen. He commended PSC for nominating. He said it is a wonderful acknowledgement of the technology that went into the buildings is part of the mission of PSC to tell that part of the story of science.

Shannon Nichol spoke in support of nomination and spoke of the importance of PSC noting references to the influences of this project as the 20<sup>th</sup> Century

“Court of Honor”. She noted the white utopian courtyard. She said it is a signature piece and pointed out that her firm takes people from around the world to see PSC. She provided photos of PSC that were discovered in a box at a garage sale.

Bryce Seidl asked the Board to also consider Criterion B and said the team of architects was very important. He said PSC was founded and formed by Seattle’s visionary leaders. He said PSC predated the Exploratorium and its first director was Dr. Dixie Lee Ray who went on to be Governor of Washington. He noted the “misfit” of an institution built around science and technology to also be an historic building and looked forward to finding ways for the facility to work as both. He pointed out the need for maintenance/repair especially the need for caulk between the concrete pads and noted potential grant sources for funding to assist with meeting the needs of the buildings.

#### Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma fully supported nomination noting that it is a great space. He said one can’t tell where one designer ends and another starts. He said the arches, figuratively, are the gateway arch to the City. He commented on the millions of kids who have passed through the arches and been impacted by them. He said the 1962 World’s Fair is an historical event. He said that Yamasaki and Halpern were an outstanding team and he noted the building does exhibit the visible characteristics of a style. He noted the spatial location and the alignment of the arches with a north – south axis.

Mr. Savage commended Mr. Peterson on a fabulous presentation. He described the series of buildings as “simple but elegant” noting the arches and integrative design. He said PSC meets all the criteria. He said the team as a whole was outstanding and noted that Christensen, one of the best engineers Seattle ever had worked a lot in pre-cast concrete during the phase when it was becoming popular and had worked on the Kingdome. He supported nomination.

Ms. Wirsching supported the Staff Recommendation and including Criterion B. She thanked the applicant for the nomination and said PSC has tremendous local and national significance.

Mr. Veith said PSC was a big part of the World’s Fair and noted some of the peculiarities of the design: the enormous elegant spaces with tiny entries. He said it is an iconic building and meets at least five of the criteria. He said that advertising images for the fair show the Space Needle, the Monorail and the PSC arches and that the iconic connections between this set of buildings and that event can’t be avoided. He said the event is significant in Seattle history. He supported looking at Criterion B as a possibility noting there were a

number of people associated with this facility. He said the irregular footprint is suggestive of the footprint of a Japanese house with its garden. He said it is a very formal structure yet picks up a sense of easiness and more romantic qualities. He said it is on important byways and is a marker for the City. He said it is an obvious landmark.

Ms. Strong said the PSC is responsible for her love of architecture noting that (in 1962) she could see the spires from Capitol Hill and could hardly wait for the fair to open. She commended Mr. Peterson for a great report and gave kudos to the applicant for doing the nomination. She supported nomination and asked if the petal fountains were included.

Ms. Chave said they were included as part of the site.

Mr. Hannum supported nomination and appreciated the applicant nominating it. He said it is a great asset and clearly a landmark.

Ms. Howard supported nomination and thanked PSC for doing the nomination. She commended Mr. Peterson for the great job. She said it meets all six criteria and noted that it incorporates light and reflection.

Mr. Abelsen commended Mr. Peterson for the great job and said it is an amazing building noting the delicate expression of design.

Mr. Veith commented on the excellent informed structure of the building noting that the tilt-up panels and the T-sections that form the roof are significant and that he hopes they will remain visible from the interior.

Action: I move approval of the Pacific Science Center at 200 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. N. for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include:

- The site, including the entry towers, walkways and pools.
- The exteriors of the buildings, excluding the following: the Seattle Rotary Discovery Labs Building (Building 6A), the Boeing IMAX Theater and Exhibit Wing, the north entry ticket kiosks, the temporary office trailer and the temporary lunch tent.
- The interior of the Laser Dome Theater, excluding the existing seating.
- The interior of the theater in Building 5, excluding the existing seating.
- The interiors of the exhibit buildings where the structural elements of the buildings are exposed.

that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for July 21, 2010; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.”

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

**060210.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

060209.41 Galbraith House  
1729 17<sup>th</sup> Ave.

Ms. Chave presented the request for extension received from the owners’ representative.

Action: I move to extend the period of consideration for the Galbraith House at 1729 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. for a period of six months.

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

060209.42 Fitch Nutt House  
4401 Phinney Ave. N.

Ms. Chave explained that she had not heard from the property owner, and that the attorney who had been representing this owner previously did not believe he was still the legal representative. She requested an extension to give the property owner time to respond and if they don’t respond then there will be a Staff recommendation for Controls. She commented that it was an unusual circumstance. She said the property owner was notified of the meeting by mail with a copy of the agenda.

Ms. Strong reported that the property is currently on the market and is pending a feasibility study – and has been since February. She expressed concern that the information that the house is designated a landmark is not being communicated in the sales process.

Ms. Chave said with regard to the attorney who said he didn’t believe he was still the legal representative she didn’t think the owner had communicated to him on whether or not he is still retained.

Action: In the absence of any correspondence from the owner regarding the status of the Controls and Incentives negotiation for the Fitch Nutt House, I move that we extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Fitch Nutt House at 4401 Phinney Ave. N. for a period of two months.

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

**060210.5 BOARD BUSINESS**

**060210.6 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator