



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 346/10

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, August 18, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom
Rebecca Frestedt

Absent

Christine Howard

Chair Vernon Abelsen called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

Messrs. Finrow and King arrived at 3:33 p.m.

081810.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of July 21, 2010

MM/SC/TV/MS 7:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Hannum
abstained.

081810.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

081810.21

Columbia City Theater
4916 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City District)

Proposed signage and installation of exterior lighting fixtures

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed revision to existing business identification signage, including: removal of the centrally-located MDO band sign; revision of the text on the southern-most band sign; and, application of vinyl decal lettering on the interior of the entrance door and proposed installation of four (4) goose neck lighting fixtures mounted above the signage. Exhibits included drawings and photographs. She explained that the Columbia City Theater was constructed in 1920 and is a contributing building within the District. The LPB approved a Certificate of Approval for the existing signage in December 2007. On August 3rd, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for signage and lighting, as proposed.

Applicant Comment:

C. B. Shamah, co-owner of The Bourbon at the Columbia City Theater, explained the sign in the center would be removed, a new one added on the door and the northernmost Columbia City sign will remain. He said that gooseneck lighting will be added to highlight the signage and said the lighting is similar to existing fixtures at Tutta Bella. He explained that the proposed colors are the same as existing and only the graphics have changed. He said that the lights will be painted to match the burgundy on the door.

Ms. Wine arrived at 3:40 p.m.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith commented that the signs appear to meet the Guidelines, the lights are not terribly obvious and show more of the existing fabric. He noted that the signs are being replaced in-kind.

Ms. Wirsching noted that the lights are being attached on the back side of the parapet which will not be readily visible.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage and lighting for the Columbia City Theater, located at 4916 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

2. Building Materials and Fixtures. Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

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.

- a. **Window Signs and Hanging Signs.** Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront or façade.

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.

MM/SC/MH/AL 9:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Wine abstained.

081810.22 NE Corner of Rainier Ave. S. and S. 39th St.
(Columbia City District)

Proposed revisions within the right-of-way

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed revisions to the right-of-way to accommodate installation of an ADA ramp and a pedestrian light fixture. Exhibits included a photograph and plans. She reported that the LPB approved a Certificate of Approval for curb expansion and bus stop improvements at this location in June 2009. On August 3rd, 2010 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for the proposed street use revisions.

Jonathan Dong and Mike Ward from Seattle Department of Transportation presented the application and Mr. Dong explained that they found funding for the pedestrian signal and said there would be four changes to the site plan.

Mr. Ward went over the diagram and pointed out what was previously approved and what changes they are asking for. He explained the changes to the curb and curb cuts. He said the ADA ramp style was chosen because it seemed to be the one that worked best considering the slope. He said that the brass-inlaid compass will be moved to be centered within the score pattern.

Ms. Wirsching asked for clarification regarding the design of the ramp configuration.

Mr. Ward said he they wanted to extend the nose out a little bit. He said that they can't use brick for ADA ramps; they use the dimpled surface ramp which is a nationwide standard. They propose to extend it out a bit more than typical and match the crosswalk which is 10' wide.

Mr. Abelsen asked why the band on either side of the ramp couldn't be brick.

Mr. Ward said you typically go with a textured concrete surface because the brick can get a little slick if it goes into a typical pedestrian area or crosswalk approach area.

Mr. Savage noted that in the previously approval they had gone from concrete to brick.

Mr. Dong said that they are proposing a safe pedestrian crossing and that the texture is provided for safe pedestrian movement.

Mr. Abelsen asked if SDOT would consider a textured brick if it were available

The applicants said they would find out.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said it is already pretty busy and said that if the concrete swath became brick then it would become less busy, which he preferred. He said since the other brick is also paving one would assume they wouldn't put an unsafe paving brick in.

Mr. Hannum said that the brick matches other in the district and said since just the incline would be textured concrete – he said it would be preferable to have the concrete rather than different types of brick.

Mr. Luoma said that it is only 4' wide where the truncated domes are right now and having a larger space that is very distinct to the brick would add to the pedestrian safety by enhancing it and drawing attention to the pedestrian crosswalk.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for street use on the NE corner of Rainier Ave. S. and S. 39th Street with the added option of using brick and a textured brick. 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

7. Street Use. Any work that affects a street, alley, sidewalk, or other public right-of-way, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board. Emphasis shall be placed on creating and maintaining pedestrian-oriented public spaces and rights-of-way. Street trees and other plant materials that add human enjoyment to the District shall be encouraged. Decorative treatments within the sidewalk, including special paving patterns and building entryway tiling shall be preserved. The use of alleys for services and public-oriented activities shall be encouraged.

MM/SC/SS/JF 10:0:0 Motion carried.

081810.23 The Baroness Apartment Hotel
1005 Spring Street

Postponed by applicant.

081810.24 Washington Athletic Club
523 Union Avenue

Summary of proposed changes: Proposed signage and storefront alterations.

Tracy Wood, Callison, explained that the Bank at the corner location is expanding. She said they propose to make the storefront area of the expansion space contiguous and match existing conditions. She explained that the color shown on the drawings was not correct and provided samples of the Dakota Mahogany for the knee wall beneath the storefront. She said the awning will remain in the same location and be on the same bracketing system so they won't disturb the terracotta. She said the awning will be plain without signage on it. She said they propose to put in a new store front in that opening and will make it match existing. She said there will be bulkhead signage inside the space; there is a pocket detail in the package. She said the packet also contains glazing base detail showing the condition that they are matching. She said there are photos provided showing the existing storefront that is being matched and pointed out an interstitial mullion that obstructs signage; they are trying to get that out but they haven't done the structural engineering to figure it out. She said that optimally they would like to remove it but not sure if they can do that.

Mr. Bowen said the signage is pretty basic noting there are two new projecting signs. One is existing that is being replaced with a new one that will match the additional one. The vinyl will continue across without the ad panel. He said the safety vinyl in the window is called "second surface"; he provided a sample. He said they are also adding the bulkhead sign. He provided detail on the plate that they redesigned to fit the grout joint and directed Board members to the drawing. He noted they would make three penetrations to the grout and not to the tile.

Board Questions:

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Bowen said that the larger plate for the blade sign will cover the existing holes.

Ms. Wine asked why the vertical mullion for the new storefront window was not just put to each side.

Ms. Wood said there are strict standards on the branding and that the preference is to remove the mullion; if the mullion can't be removed they could just increase the space between the two.

Mr. Bowen said the mullion is not much of an obstruction. He said that the elevation on page 3 is good and shows the shadow of the mullion and the distance. He said that safety vinyl is being applied on the inside of the window because the sign will be behind; it is removable but removal would require a heat gun and razor.

Ms. Wood explained that the glass will be ½” - ¾” and if it starts to look different and the profile of the aluminum extrusion looks different – really want the mullion out. She said the orientation of the bank - 80° in the summer. She said if they increase the profile by ¼” or a little less it would be the same finish; a trained eye would detect the difference but the lay person would not.

Public Comment:

Dennis Williams, WAC, also expressed concern about any penetrations into the terracotta. He said they are getting the store front back to its 1930s condition and called the work a positive step.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen requested a motion and suggested that possible changes to the frame at the store front come back to Staff for review.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage and storefront alterations on the Washington Athletic Club at 1325 6th Avenue, per the attached submittal with the provision that any adjustments in storefront window design be reviewed by Staff.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 122948 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/JF/SS 10:0:0 Motion carried.

081810.25 Pier 54

Summary of proposed changes: Proposed window replacement and installation of interior roof insulation.

Bob Donegan, Ivar’s, explained that the roof is leaking and that before new windows are put in they need to shore up the trusses. He provided photos and noted the clerestory windows. He explained that the pier has two structural systems that meet at the center, and noted the difficulty in trying to insulate the building. He said that putting insulation on the outside would require extensive

structural work so they have opted for insulation hung from inside. He provided a spreadsheet showing the condition of the windows noting the general bad shape with deterioration, the header above the windows is settling, and dry rot.

Mr. Donegan said that the truss structure is designated and what you want to see; the roof joists are not. He showed a detail of how the trusses fit into the wall. He explained that the preferred color for the windows is Antique Bronze; a chip chart was provided. He said that when the pier was built the trim was probably not painted and that he thought the Antique Bronze would be neutral enough.

Ms. Sodt explained that architect Erin Doherty took samples and suspects that historically the windows were likely either stained or painted a dark color.

Mr. Donegan showed a photo of an insulation installation at an adjacent pier as an example of what was being proposed; he said the hung insulation would be pinned into place. He pointed out that the improvements required to shore up the pier were called out in detail on the plans. Responding to clarifying questions he explained that they would sister on to existing trusses and joists boards of the same dimension to bring it level and plumb. He said they would use straight grain rough cut fir.

Mr. Abelsen referred to A5.01 and said there are three different profiles of existing windows and one new profile for replacement noting that the replacement were not true divided light. He asked if there was an opportunity for a closer match.

Mr. Donegan explained that what they selected is the closest match and he noted that the windows on the west are different from the windows on the east.

Mr. Abelsen commented that the depth of the mullion is more noticeable and provide a shadow line.

Mr. Donegan said they looked at everything to match as close as possible what it there and noted the need to meet the energy code.

Mr. Abelsen questioned if the Board were to approve this for the clerestory would it set a precedent for other changes.

Mr. Donegan said they hadn't considered anything else beyond the roof project and that other work is years away. Responding to questions about the structural elements he reiterated that they will use rough sawn, unfinished material. In cases where there is dry rot they will replace boards and in other areas they will sister boards onto existing and will then jack the roof into position.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said it was straightforward and reasonable. He said the clerestory windows stand alone and although the proposed replacements are not an exact match, it is reasonable given that the windows will only be seen from some distance.

Mr. Savage commented that the windows being replaced are not original.

Mr. Veith noted he would have preferred to see the joisting but that the insulation will be obviously new and one will know there is structure behind. He said the windows are not original and the replacements will maintain the character of the building.

Mr. Hannum noted that from the vantage point of a pedestrian looking at the windows the change will not be readily visible.

Ms. Wirsching commented that the applicant originally considered white for the windows and what is now proposed is a better solution; she said the dark color is more compatible with the building and less readily apparent.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed window replacement and installation of interior roof insulation on Pier 54 at 1001 Alaskan Way, per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior and interior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report 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/JF/SS 10:0:0 Motion carried.

081810.3 DESIGNATION

081810.31 Admiral's House
2001 W. Garfield St.

Mimi Sheridan, architectural historian, presented the report (full report available in DON file). She provided an aerial view and pointed what the site

and area proposed for designation. She pointed out minor changes: the railings on the side porches have been changed, the flag pole has been moved, in the 1960s the hillside slid, filling the living room with mud – this has been repaired and a hedge was planted.

Ms. Sheridan explained that the interior is not included in the designation because it is quite simple. She said it has fir floors and nothing of particular interest on the interior. She said that all the fixtures had been replaced, the kitchen was remodeled. She said that the pantry is the most intact space except for the hardware. She provided photos of other admiral's residences for comparison to this one.

Ms. Sheridan explained that the house has classic Colonial Revival features and pointed out its symmetrical façade, center entry vestibule with pilasters and the 8/8 windows with shutters.

Michael Nanney, owner's representative with Forest City Project Management, said they will be selling the home and noted the importance of not designating the interior to retain flexibility for new owners to do with the interior as they wish.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wirsching asked if the house is the last remaining element of the base at the site.

Ms. Sheridan affirmed it was.

Mr. Nanney said that Quarters B which was on the site, is gone now as a result of a mudslide.

There was a discussion about the original shutters; the existing shutters are vinyl. The original shutters were larger and not slatted and painted a light color.

Mr. Veith asked if it was a choice that the interior spaces are spare.

Ms. Sheridan and Mr. Nanney noted that the Ft. Lawton house was not as spare as this one and the Bremerton House was more ornate.

Ms. Sheridan commented that an article highlighted that this house was built with the same materials as what was used for the enlisted men.

Public Comment:

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, appreciated the nomination and supported designation based on the Staff Report – Standards C, D, and F; she said that the interiors should not be included.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, agreed with Ms. Eggleston and noted that the fir floors are beautiful.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Finrow supported designation based on the Staff Report and said the interior is not worthy of designation.

Ms. Wirsching concurred with Mr. Finrow and supported designation based on the Staff Report. She said the interior is not remarkable and less worthy of designation.

Mr. Luoma agreed and said it is a wonderful building, view and site. He supported designation based on the Staff Report and did not support including the interior. He noted the significance of three levels of use: entertainment, servant and living quarters and noted the distinct stairs. He hoped that future owners would recognize that.

Ms. Strong supported designation based on the Staff Report – C, D, and F.

Mr. Hannum supported designation and said he appreciated Criterion F noting the significant location.

Ms. Wine supported designation based on C, D, and F.

Mr. Veith supported designation noting that Criterion F was the strongest and said that Criterion C was appropriate because of the association of the Navy with Seattle and association with the naval facility and its long use as a semi public facility in the region. He said it is not a great example of style but that he would not oppose to the inclusion of Criterion D.

Mr. Savage agreed with Mr. Veith and said he supported designation based on the Staff Report – C, D, and F.

Mr. King agreed with the Staff Report – C, D, and F. He said the exterior and grounds are impressive and worthy; the interior is not.

Mr. Abelsen supported designation based on the Staff Report and noted that it has been in the public realm for so long. He said it is simple in design and what is most significant is its place in the City.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building and the site, excluding the existing garage.

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

081810.4 NOMINATIONS

081810.41 Bel-Roy Apartments
703 Bellevue Ave. E.

Chris Rogers, of Point 32, represented the ownership group and noted that the owners support designation. He noted the aspects of its design that would get high marks in sustainability – narrow building profiles, the point block circulation, maximizing daylight, and natural ventilation for all of the units. He said he concurs with the Staff Report in support of the nomination.

Mimi Sheridan presented the nomination report (full report available in DON file). Ms. Sheridan provided context of the building and site at the edge of the freeway. She pointed out the older buildings and older houses across the street from the first and second decade of the 20th Century. She noted that the building was not allowed to deteriorate. She said the L-shaped building is hidden from the road. She pointed out the private garden and the red brick with the light bands. From the aerial view she pointed out the triangular bays that allow in more light and air. She said from the garden side, the building is four stories.

Ms. Sheridan noted the entry Art Deco style entry pylon with cast stone ornament. She pointed out the point block arrangement and noted that each stack of stories was not connected. She said the main entry has a wider stairway and access only the first group of apartments. She noted that there are seven primary entries with distinct hood and steel support and seven secondary entries.

She said the ornamentation is simple – bricks at an angle along cornices. She said that all windows are the original steel sash. She explained that there are no common spaces on the interior and that each stack has its own entrance; each stack has two units on each floor. She noted the Art Deco details and the interior doorways angled in Art Deco style. She said the units are studio and one-bedroom units. She noted the original floor tile in the bathroom but noted slight variations in color and type of tile used. She said that improvements have been made to the building as needed over time.

Ms. Sheridan provided information on building architects Bain and Pries. She said that William Bain had a residential practice in Seattle and partnered with Pries for four years. He served as the State Camouflage Director during WWII, worked on Yesler Terrace and formed Naramore, Bain, Brady and Johanson. She said that Lionel Pries was primarily an educator but was also a residential designer; he partnered with Bain for four years and did Revival style residences, apartments and fraternity buildings. She said he was an influential educator at the University of Washington from 1928-1958.

Board Questions:

Mr. Finrow asked if the horizontal color was original banding or if it had been painted.

Ms. Sheridan said the bricks are at an angle and have been painted.

Mr. Rogers said that Bain's wife refers to the off white or cream banding as original. Responding to clarifying questions he explained that most of the interior and common area doors are original and said that light fixtures have been replaced. He said that before I-5 was constructed the area was a wooded slope and said the vegetative buffer is now owned by WASDOT. He said there used to be a large neon "B" on top of the building; it is no longer there.

Mr. Luoma said the garden looked ornate and asked if it was historical.

Ms. Sheridan explained that it had not been designed; it is nice but not old.

Mr. Rogers explained that he used to live in the building and the garden was nicer in the 1980s.

Mr. Veith noted the point block entry system and said there is a large collection of this type building north of the Ballard Locks.

Ms. Sheridan said this type is not rare but is unusual.

Mr. Finrow stated that he thought it is rare.

Mr. Veith noted that the 2nd entry group is found on buildings north of the locks.

Ms. Sheridan said that it is rare that the secondary and primary entries are on the same side – right next to each other – usually they are on the front and rear.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson thanked the owner and said the building is a wonderful example of Art Deco and of Bain and Pries' work. She supported nomination.

Jeffrey Ochsner said he supported nomination and designation. He said that in a book on Pries – the late 1920s and 1930s – illustrates this one. He said that this apartment of Bain and Pries has the most user-friendly features and has the most aesthetically sophisticated floor plan with the serrated edge. He said that the bands were painted originally. He said at the beginning of the Depression it was an economical treatment of Art Deco design. He noted the point block created units and said the building had been beautifully maintained. He said it is significant and beautiful and designed by a significant Seattle practice.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Finrow called it a fabulous building and said that although he drives by frequently he has never stopped. He said he was impressed by the detailing and integrity. He said it is the gold standard for integrity and that it is remarkable.

Ms. Wirsching supported nomination based on the Staff Report. She wondered if there were features in the common areas – the entries to units and the entry way architectural detail – that should be included.

Mr. Veith said the stairway at the major entry was simply done and one could almost say a plain solution but that has an appearance that was reminiscent of “deco” Hollywood sets of the period and noted the solid panels. He was not in favor of including interior spaces, only public space.

Mr. Savage said that criteria D and E were the strongest and without having seen the photos F would be difficult. He said there was not much difference between this and other buildings by Bain and Pries.

Regarding Criterion F Mr. Veith said he has been aware of the building for a while and said it is quite visible from the freeway. He noted the two-sided bays and called the banding “iconic”; he said it is a striking example. He called Criterion F the strongest of the criteria. He said the building is a clear embodiment of the style in the City and said has high integrity. He said the building is a good example of the residential work of Bain and Pries and an outstanding example of their apartments.

Mr. Finrow suggested another way of reading Criterion F is that the scale is remarkable and he noted how it is integrated into the neighborhood in a way that is quiet and respectful. He said it is not prominent and he pointed out that the way that houses in front really mask the massing is remarkable.

Ms. Wine agreed with Mr. Finrow and said that although she used to live in the neighborhood she hadn't understood the full size of the building. She said it is very distinctive.

Mr. Hannum said he agreed with Mr. Finrow and said it is a unique building and one of the few where the building wraps around residential and remains quiet. He strongly supported nomination.

Mr. Abelsen said he has long admired the building and noted that the aerial photos were helpful. He commented that many Board members mentioned the interiors and he suggested a poll.

It was Board consensus to include interior common areas.

Action: I move approval of the Bel-Roy Apartments at 703 Bellevue Ave. E. 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, the interior common areas and the site; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for October 6, 2010; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

081810.42 Yesler Terrace and the Kenyon Apartments
825-903 Yesler Way and 905 Spruce Street

Anne Fiske Zuniga, Seattle Housing Authority, reported that Yesler Terrace does not meet the threshold for landmark status. She recognized its social significance as the first public housing development in Seattle and as the first racially integrated one in the country and added that Yesler Terrace has been home to many immigrants. She explained they intend to incorporate interpretative elements to recognize those roles.

Susan Boyle presented the nomination report (full report available in DON file) with the assistance of Abby Inpanbutr. She provided an overview of the history of public housing. She explained that Yesler Terrace was low income housing and defense worker housing. It originally began as a larger complex but has undergone changes that have diminished it in size. She provided the context of the site and noted that it had been designed around the entire Harborview Hospital complex on the west and north sides. She said that it had been designed to take advantage of views which was different from how low income housing had been planned. She went over areas where buildings had been removed for the I-5 construction and for a community.

She reported that Jesse Epstein, a young attorney who helped write legislation to start the Housing Authority, replaced housing that lacked water, heat etc. She said he was the first director of Seattle Housing Authority. He went to San Francisco and was publicly accused of being Communist. He left public office in 1948 and returned to Seattle and worked as an attorney.

Yesler Terrace was designed by Stoddard, J. Lister Holmes, Bain, Aiken and Jacobsen all of whom have landmarked buildings in the City; she provided examples of their work and noted that all were selected by Epstein. She said that all were civic and design leaders. She said that there are 33 different building types which accommodate stepping or changes in topography. She noted the original landscape features, low wood picket fences and trellis elements. She said the interiors were simple, clean, no doors except for bathroom and open shelves served as linen closets.

Ms. Boyle explained that the community buildings were heavily used by community driven activities. She said it is two-story with a continuous basement. She said the 1943 Yesler Terrace Management Office was demolished in 2003 for the new Parks Community Center.

She described the Steam Plant as “remarkable” and noted its three curved walls, concrete foundation and said that it is constructed of reinforced, poured-in-place concrete. She noted the horizontally striated texture on the board-form concrete facades and the concrete stack rising from its center.

Ms. Boyle explained the changes to the Jessie Epstein Building including the infill of the light wells formed by the E-shape. She said the entries, windows and interiors were all changed.

She explained that the second phase of Yesler Terrace construction added two to three story defense worker housing buildings which she pointed out have seen dramatic changes over time.

She noted elements of the residential units – flow through ventilation, simple layouts and went over changes that have been made including the replacement of wood windows with vinyl, the addition of two-story closets, roofs changed from flat to sloped, and cladding to vinyl in the early phase and to rough cedar in the defense worker housing. She said that stylistically the buildings don’t represent the era of construction.

She said that the community building was “blocky” and noted the changes to doors, windows, windows and cladding. She pointed out the new Parks Department community center and the addition of a play area and a p-patch.

She said that what exists now no longer embodies the original character and original meaning because so much has been taken away with the construction of I-5 and there have been so many changes. She noted changes such as roof changes, siding, vinyl windows, and patio changes. She said that of the original three community buildings one is gone and there have been changes to the other two. She said that the Kenyon Building had a lack of connection to Yesler Terrace until 1972 when it was accessed as an office building. She said that the Steam Plant building is completely different – it is not wood frame nor is it residential. She pointed out its concrete form and noted that it has not operated since 1990. She said that while it has strong architectural character she questioned whether or not it has significance at a City-wide level.

Ms. Boyle said that in the context of Seattle, one can't verify that it is the first, last or only and she said there is other public housing nationwide and she cited Richmond, California, which is on the National Register, Armisted Garden in Baltimore and a couple in Chicago. She again noted the loss of integrity at Yesler Terrace.

Board Questions:

Mr. Finrow said he agreed about the residential portion but said that the Steam Plan has a lot of merit. He said that as an architectural piece it is unique and reflective of ideas about modern construction. He said the integrity of the Community Building was not all that good. He stated that the hierarchy of spatial aspects – the courtyard, loggia, and the “community-ness” are intact. He said that there have been changes but the essential quality is still intact and he asked Ms. Boyle to elaborate on the changes made to the Community Building.

Ms. Boyle said that one building - the gym - with its spatial quality of enclosure is inviting with the open loggia. She said that there had been some changes – the office building component and noted the entry was mundane and straightforward. She explained that the Steam Plant was sited where it could flow downward and was a different heating type; this was the first public housing with steam heating. She said that the Steam Plant is an interesting building with its curved elements following the street and along the alley that it showed real architectural interest. She said that the expression overcame what would have been conventional techniques at the time.

Mr. Finrow asked if there were any heritage trees on site.

Ms. Boyle said the City has them listed and that there is one near the Community Building and she said there is a willow near the Steam Plant with a plaque identifying it as having been started from a twig from Napoleon's grave in Ste. Helena.

Responding to clarifying questions, Ms. Sodt explained that the nomination – which encompasses the entire existing campus on different parcels - was not “all or nothing”; what would be nominated – or not – was up to the Board.

Asked about the 1979 National Register Nomination Ms. Boyle said it did not meet eligibility based on integrity.

Mr. Luoma asked if the landscape architects were involved in the overall layout or were they just provided a site plan.

Ms. Boyle said it was all a collaborative effort and she didn’t know who did what. She said that Sturtevant went on to work on Holly Park and other low income developments.

Public Comment:

John Fox, Coordinator for Seattle Displacement Coalition, provided written comments (full text available in DON file). He supported nomination and said it retains 2/3 of the original units. He said that the overall design and siting were a unique experiment to serve families with children. He said it was the first racially integrated housing project and has been a place for first generation immigrants and the poor pointing out that it was used as a way up and out.

Kristin O’Donnell, Yesler Terrace resident, said the wood siding is still there and said it is a good place to live; she said it was well-designed. She said that Jessie Epstein and team deliberately built something that was a monument of how good the “new deal” could be. She said there are cosmetic issues but the bones are still there. She said that originally when Yesler Terrace was designed thought was given to giving people light, air, privacy and views – although not in the defensive worker housing. She noted the multi-cultural living environment. She said the design is elegant, pointing out the long rectangles, changes in elevation and said that there are at least six significant trees on the site.

Board Discussion:

Mr. King commented that there is historical significance at the local, state and national levels but noted the integrity issues. He noted the siting integrity of the overall site but said he wasn’t sure that could rise above integrity issues.

Mr. Savage commented that Holly Park and Highpoint played a part in the City’s history and both have been replaced with new and modern facilities. He noted the many changes and loss of integrity and said it is noticeable as one big site only from a distance.

Mr. Veith said he agreed with the presenter and said that the complex has suffered greatly and he noted the loss of integrity. He said the harder question was its ability to convey significance. He said it is hard to talk about post-war architecture and planning without looking at this site and its relationship to the Central Area and International District. He said an argument could be made for prominence because it is strategically and clearly located in the interstitial space between multiple neighborhoods and forms a “knuckle” there. But he said it would be hard to argue for controlling anything other than the Steam Plant.

Ms. Wine said there is still integrity in terms of planning and siting but the architectural integrity has been lost. She said that without understanding the background or reading the report she said it would be unable to convey its significance. She said she would consider supporting the Community Center and Steam Plant.

Mr. Hannum said the integrity has diminished over time and he questioned what would be controlled represents a plan but the buildings don’t have integrity and he noted the loss of integrity over the entire site. He expressed interest in nominating the Steam Plant.

Ms. Strong commented that it was quite a story and noted the driving force of Epstein. She commented on the loss of integrity and said she would not support nomination. She said she was open to looking at the Steam Plant.

Mr. Luoma said the pieces contribute to the whole – each has a part – but a lot of pieces are no longer there or are unable to convey their significance and integrity. He said what was beautiful was the whole. He said he would have looked past the integrity issues if the plan as a whole had been intact – the garden community aspect has been lost because of I-5 and other changes. He did not support nomination but said that the Steam Plant pops out as a key element because the stack and its design have the ability to convey integrity and meaning.

Ms. Wirsching did not support nomination noting integrity issues; she questioned if the planning or the plan would be enough to convey its significance. She said she was not aware of any precedent for a planning element.

Mr. Finrow agreed with Ms. Wirsching. He stated that his expertise is in housing and questioned if the applicant would consider aspects of the site. He noted that at least 80% of the character is attributable to planning as opposed to the buildings. Light, air – because that is what they were about. They were not high quality – they were made of the cheapest crappiest materials and all have the same issues of falling apart. He questioned if we destroy that history

and let it disappear or try to salvage parts that remind us. He questioned if there was some way to retain key issues of the terrace and allow the rest to be redeveloped. He said to make a decision about the entire complex is impossible. He said we are down to one example left because the other local examples have been transformed. He noted the Steam Plant and the Community Center as possibilities.

Mr. Abelsen commented on a 1941 photo - provided as part of public testimony – of the whole Yesler Terrace and said that it has all changed. He noted that it was the first racially integrated housing in the country. He was not supportive of nominating the war housing or the Kenyon Building but as indicated by Mr. Finrow he said the buildings were lesser to the site planning. He said that it is clear that the planning is significant.

Mr. Finrow said that two-thirds to three-quarters of the original siting remains. He said that without question the Steam Plant is architecturally significant and possibly the Community Center. He said that culturally Jesse Epstein was important to the development of Seattle Housing Authority to this site.

Board members discussed the possibility of deferral of the nomination pending more information and the difficulty of considering the nomination because of its complexity. It also considered whether if nominated details could be discussed and worked out during Controls and Incentives or whether the Board could defer and request additional information or nominate it and ask for additional information. After a straw poll Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision to deny the nomination with the exception of the Steam Plant and the Community Building.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of Yesler Terrace and the Kenyon Apartments at 825-903 Yesler Way and 905 Spruce Street as a Seattle Landmark, with the exception of the Steam Plant and the Community Building, as these properties do not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/SS/MH 6:0:4 Motion carried. Ms. Wirsching, Messrs. Finrow, Veith and King opposed.

Action: I move to approve the nomination of the Steam Plant and Community Building on the Yesler Terrace site at 903 Yesler Way 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 and that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for October 6, 2010; that this action conforms to the known Comprehensive and Development Plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/TV/JF 8:0:2 Motion carried. Ms. Wirsching and Mr. King opposed.

081810.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

081810.51 Seattle Japanese Language School
1414 S. Weller St.

Ms. Chave explained the request for an extension until the second meeting in December.

Action: I move to extend consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Japanese Language School at 1414 S. Weller St. until the second meeting in December.

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

081810.6 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Gordon explained that a Public Hearing on Fort Lawton guidelines would be included at the next meeting. She explained the original district had been designated in the 1970s. She said the Guidelines were posted on the DON website. She said the Board will not vote, that this will be only a Public Hearing regarding a Certificate of Approval process and the purpose is to get public comment.

Ms. Chave said there will be no Board discussion and no vote; the Board will just listen.

081810.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator