



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 480/09

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday September 16, 2009 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Tom Veith
Vernon Abelsen
Mollie Tremaine
Marie Strong
Aaron Luoma
Meredith Wirsching
Steve Savage

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Alyce Conti
Stephen Lee
Christine Howard
Mark Hannum

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

091609.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of August 5, 2009
MM/SC/MT/MW

7:0:0 Minutes approved as amended.

Ms. Strong arrived at 3:35 p.m.

091609.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

091609.21 1005 Belmont Pl E
(Harvard-Belmont District)

Proposed alterations to north sunroom

Ms. Chave provided photos of the house and explained it is a Category 1 house.

Owner Scott Blankenship explained that they intend to preserve the existing footprint and just make it more functional. He went over the details of the north sunroom addition and showed an existing view of the house as seen from the street. He explained the plan to put a bathroom in the center of the sun porch and will put in windows to match the other windows in the house. He said they will keep a glass door and the view from the street will remain the same. He mentioned their desire to keep the quality and the character of the existing fabric and to restore the house to its original grandeur. They plan to remove later additions which he pointed out in photos. It will be put in to meet existing code. Stone at the front of the house will come from the Wilkinson quarry to get the same stone that matches the house and they found 100 year old brick and clinkers to match the brick of the house. The window on the sun porch will be pushed out into the port- cochere; it will be extended on the east side about 4 ½ feet.

Ms. Chave said the Harvard Belmont conducted an on-site review of the proposal. She said that the Committee thought the glazing on the north side of the house was not highly visible, but the proposed changes what is visible is appropriate and meets the guidelines. She explained that details were provided for the reconstructed railing on top of the port- cochere and said they will be a bit higher than the original. She said woodwork and stucco will match existing.

Responding to Board member questions, project architect Michael Gibson said there would be no change to the 2nd gable and said that everything they are proposing, except for the railing, will be below the roof level of the port-chochere.

Responding to Board member questions, Ms. Chave explained that the proposed changes are not very visible from the street.

Ms. Wirsching, who attended the Harvard Belmont Committee meeting, noted the very limited visibility due to the fence which will remain and that the sunroom enclosure is not original to the building. She said the proposed replacement railing around the port-cochere will be consistent with what is on the west side. She noted the proposal was simple and straightforward and doesn't negatively impact the character of the house or the district.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Strong, who also attended the Harvard Belmont Review Committee, supported the application and agreed with Ms. Wirsching's comments.

Mr. Veith noted there would be no impact on the character of the District.

Mr. Abelsen indicated agreement with other Board members comments and said it was reasonable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for alterations to the north sunroom and port-cochere, as per the applicant's submittal. The stucco and wood trim is to match the existing stucco and wood trim on the house in finish and color. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

C. 1. Additions or renovations:

Guideline: Additions should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is being preserved.

Guideline: The exterior materials used for additions shall be similar to exterior materials used in the original building and should be finished in ways that are consistent with the original building.

MM/SC/TV/SS

7:0:0 Motion carried.

091609.22

678 B Washington Ave

Ft. Lawton Landmark District

Proposed tree replacement plan for tree removed by applicant

Ms. Chave provided background on the application and presented the staff report. (see LPB 469/09). She said that at the Landmarks Preservation Board meeting of May 20, 2009, the Board reviewed the owner's Certificate of Approval application for the retroactive approval of the removal of one Western Red Cedar tree in the Fort Lawton Landmark District. She said that the Board's action was to defer consideration of the application until the Board received a plan approved by the City Arborist for replacement of the tree with another tree or trees. She said that subsequently, the City Arborist asked that the Senior Urban Forester for the City's Parks Department, Mark Mead, prepare the replacement plan, as Mr. Mead is most familiar with the subject site. Mr. Mead provided a site plan (attached to staff report), which included the following:

- A memo that specifies the replacement tree species, size and condition
- A site plan showing the location of where the replacement trees are to be planted
- Standard specifications for the owner to follow (Section 02950; Landscape plantings)

She said in addition, Mr. Mead also recommended to Board staff that the two replacement trees be planted before December 1, 2009. He also recommended that the owner provide to the Board, for Board review and approval, a contract between the owner and a landscape professional for the installation and maintenance of the trees for a minimum of three years.

Michael Nanney, Vice President of Forest City Military Communities Northwest, explained the tree was removed in November 2008 and he didn't know the landscape was landmarked. He agreed that the planting of two trees for one is acceptable, but noted the difficulty with complying with the contract portion of the request because their contracts cover 3000 units, not just Fort Lawton.

Ms. Chave explained the necessity for having a document confirming the work being done that would satisfy the Board and applicant.

Mr. Luoma explained that he didn't see the specific species chosen but noted the difficulty in containing roots which could buckle the street and sidewalk. He recommended the tree be planted precisely in the middle of the planting strip. He said that a 10' wide planting strip should be plenty to prevent buckling as long as it is placed in the middle. He said if it is less than 10' he recommended a root barrier on the sidewalk side.

Mr. Nanney confirmed that they do that now on all their projects.

Ms. Strong requested the applicant provide in writing to Staff specifying what Parks specified.

Ms. Chave suggested a condition on the motion that directs them to come back to ARC, Board or to Staff.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen advised Board members to be specific in the language in the motion.

Mr. Veith read the suggestions from Parks that state that *"the owner must provide contract between the owner and a landscape professional that*

specifies installation and a three-year maintenance plan” and said typically a contract would include a drawing with detail in contract.

Ms. Tremaine suggested that it should be referred back to Staff.

Ms. Chave said she would work with Mr. Luoma and the Parks Department senior forester Mark Mead.

Mr. Luoma agreed with the species chosen and noted the historic character it would bring to the District and the street trees that are already located there.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue retroactive approval of a Certificate of Approval for the removal of the Western Red Cedar tree at 678 B Washington Ave, in the Fort Lawton Landmark District. This approval is with the condition that the owners plant two replacement trees as per the tree plan and specifications outlined by the Senior Urban Forester of the Seattle Parks Department. The two trees are to be London Plane trees (*Platanus x acerifolia*), planted as per the attached site plan and as per the attached specifications. The trees are to be planted by December 1, 2009. The owner must provide to the Board a contract between the owner and a landscape professional that specifies the following installation and a three-year maintenance plan for the two replacement trees.

This action is based on the following:

2. Tree removal adversely affects some features or characteristics of the Fort Lawton Landmark District, as mature trees are significant features of the site. Protection and retention of the matures trees on the site meets the following *Guideline* of the *Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines*:

Preserving important landscape features, including ongoing maintenance of historic plant material.

The requirement for the planting of a replacement tree (or trees) would meet the Standard #6 of the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation:

3. Planting details be provided by the applicant that shows necessary root barrier.
4. The other factors of SMC25.12.835 are not applicable

MM/SC/AL/SS

7:0:0 Motion carried.

091609.23 Josephinum/New Washington Hotel
1902 Second Avenue

Proposed new entry opening on the alley elevation and installation of a metal louver in an existing opening.

Mr. Abelsen recused himself.

Tim Smith, representing the owner – the Archdiocese, provided an overview of the services provided. He explained this site is the meeting place to fill out SHARE WHEEL paperwork to find housing and that they have provided space for that activity in the basement. Adding the new entry off the alley would give them their own entry off of Stewart and meets their long term mission.

Mr. Abelsen provided a site plan and photos pointing out on existing and proposed floor plans where the work would occur. He showed where the hole would be cut through an existing wall for the new entry. He went through the drawings and elevations with Board members explaining where a plywood panel would be removed and the new louver installed for mechanical equipment. He pointed out an existing 6' doorway from the residential units above would be changed to a 6'8" door which would be more amenable for access and egress. The door will be painted to match existing brown which is a mixture of various forms of brown used over the years.

Board Questions:

Responding to Board Questions Mr. Abelsen explained that only one louver was needed and the applicant can't afford to do the rest.

Ms. Tremaine asked about the new entry and Mr. Smith explained the entry helps to clean up aspects of the building and also provides a fire egress out of the basement.

Mr. Abelsen explained the door is required by code. He said the existing 6' door to the far right will be fixed closed.

Ms. Sodt explained that a signage proposal would come under a future application if she determines it needs to be reviewed by the Board. She said it would normally need Board approval but would check the agreement.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching stated that ARC questions were covered. She said there were structural problems with trying to make the existing 6' door taller which is why the new door is proposed and noted that ARC thought it was reasonable.

Mr. Luoma noted the changes were appropriate.

Mr. Veith said the changes are appropriate and do not significantly alter the character of the building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed new entry opening on the alley elevation and installation of a metal louver in an existing opening.

This action is based on the following:

5. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 114770 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*.
6. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/MS/MT

6:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Abelsen recused himself.

091609.3 DESIGNATIONS

091609.31 Harborview Medical Center
325 Ninth Avenue

Elise Chayet, Harborview, voiced support for the designation of Harborview Medical Center but not for Harborview Hall because she said it is not suitable for adaptive reuse.

Mimi Sheridan, Architectural Historian, presented the nomination report (full report available in DON file) and began by providing context of the site and aerial-view photos of the entire campus. Harborview Hospital is a descendent of the original hospital in Georgetown and opened in February 1931. She explained that architect Harlan Thomas of Thomas, Grainger and Thomas created a Master Plan of which only the Medical Center and Harborview Hall were actually built. She explained that Harborview was a different sort of hospital as it was for “only those who cannot pay”. She went on to describe it as a state of the art facility that also provided services not provided at other hospitals including psychiatric, outpatient, and the communicable disease wards. She went over the expansion over the years (South Wing in 1951, the North Wing in 1974-80, and the West Hospital/Clinic in 1998) and changes noting that each phase made changes to the Center Wing.

Ms. Sheridan pointed out that the tower is a major feature from all sides. She noted the Art Deco features: the sun ray, gold tile and the flame on top. She went over the massing and ornamentation on the building and noted the northwest and medical motifs found around the entry and lobby. She pointed out the canopy over the front entry and the Medic One garage and noted the rich materials in the entry and lobby. She said the only real change to the lobby is the addition of the handicapped access ramp.

John Savo, NBBJ, went over how he thought the building measured up to the Landmarks criteria and said it met criteria C, D, E and F.

Public Comment:

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, was thrilled that another Harlan Thomas building was on the agenda and favored Criterion E.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Savage said it was straightforward and supported designation based C, D, E and F, specifically F.

Ms. Tremaine supported designation based on C, D, E and F.

Ms. Wirsching said it was a no-brainer and supported designation based on C, D, E, and F.

Mr. Veith agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation based on C, D, E and F saying that F was a no-brainer. He was not as enthusiastic on E but didn't object to it.

Mr. Luoma agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation based on C, D, E, and F.

Ms. Strong supported designation based on C, D, E, and F.

Mr. Abelsen said "no brainer" says it all and supported designation citing the building, its history and background.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Harborview Medical Center, Center Wing of the East Hospital, 325 Ninth Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building and the interior of the Ninth Avenue lobby, and the

portion of the site as indicated on the revised site plan submitted by the applicant dated September 2, 2009.

MM/SC/SS/MS

7:0:0 Motion carried.

091609.32 Harborview Hall
326 Ninth Avenue

Mimi Sheridan went over the nomination report (full report in DON file); she showed aerial-view photos of the campus and explained it was the second part of the Master Plan. She went over the history of the building which was built in 1931 and housed the nursing school students until 1961. The University of Washington Medical School was established in 1946 and took over management. After the last nursing classes in 1961, it was converted to offices and laboratories. The mental health clinic was added in 1972 and the first floor was turned into mental health courtrooms. She described the building as a smaller, less elaborate version of the Center Wing.

Ms. Sheridan pointed out the Art Deco ornamentation at the entry and lobby and noted it is simpler than that at the Center Wing. She stated it had a more residential feel to it and called out the rose detail in the paneling and lighting. She said there were tea kitchens on each floor where students could gather.

John Savo, NBBJ, stated Harborview did not support designation and said there is a qualitative difference (between this building and Harborview Medical Center). He noted the hierarchical relationship and that the Center Wing was built as a major hospital serving critical needs. He said Harborview Hall, while good, is more a quiet background building designed as a support role – first as a dormitory for nurses in training and later renovated into labs and offices. He said its subordinate status starts with its use but is also expressed architecturally.

Mr. Savo explained that with regard to Criterion C, the building started as a dormitory or temporary housing and explained that nursing education was founded on apprenticeship. He provided examples of other area nursing schools which he thought better transmitted their use. He said that since it was built Harborview Hall has housed a variety of uses: residential, labs, offices and noted the lab floors have been gutted. He proceeded to elaborate on interior changes that have been made over time. He said the building does not meet Criterion C. He said its original purpose as a nurses' home was not unique; its exterior does not transmit its purpose and there are better examples of residential types elsewhere.

Mr. Savo said the building does not meet Criterion D because it is an abbreviated expression of the style and said there are better examples (Northern Life Tower, U. S. Marine Hospital and Staff Quarters, Exchange

Building). He said the stepped massing had only one “step” in the middle and he noted the lack of ornamentation, no pyramid roof and no multi-story expression. He said that while it has some nice applied details it is not outstanding and it is simple and largely lacking characteristics of the style.

Mr. Savo said the building did not meet Criterion E and showed the Sorrento in comparison. He said the building is a quiet background building playing a supporting role that it has outlived.

Kimberly McNalley, member of Board of Trustees, did not support designation. She said it was once associated with nursing education but is no longer. She went over changes to the building and noted it is seismically unsafe. She explained that it makes more sense to create an exhibit with photos and other memorabilia that would capture that era in nursing education and that they have talked with nursing associations about that.

Janice Spizzo, Clinical Operations Manager, provided a letter (letter in DON file) and did not support designation.

Leslie Harper Miles, King County, Facilities, read letters from Kathy Brown (Director of King County Facilities) and Eileen Whalen and King County Executive Ron Sims.

Tom Walsh, attorney for Harborview, summarized the presentation and reiterated Mr. Savo’s report on the criteria as well as the others who spoke on behalf of Harborview. He further noted the CAC did not support designation and had provided letters stating such.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith said the association with nursing is not the only possible aspect of cultural, political and economic history of the City. He said the buildings together were designed as fruition of replacing the hospital at Georgetown. He said that some (not all) of the newer buildings do mesh well with the original structure. He said Harborview Hall works best with the Center Wing in terms of aesthetics and complements it.

Mr. Savo said they were designed by the same architect so do have that connection but he didn’t think Harborview Hall held up as well all around. He said he likes the building but doesn’t see it as significant and noted that the plan was for several buildings and only two were built.

Mr. Abelsen noted the comments about the lack of residential scale/intent and said the scale of this building would make that difficult. He asked how many residences were in the building.

Ms. Sheridan said the 1st floor uses were education and social but everything above that was residential.

Mr. Savo said the Sorrento and the Chelsea were more suited to residential and Harborview Hall does not transmit as residential at all. While all the other examples he provided expressed their residential scale.

Mr. Abelsen noted asked if there was architectural intent behind the artificial canyon.

Mr. Savo said it is hard to see both facades and one has to be a distance away to really appreciate them. He said it was a nice move to connect the two but it wasn't taken far enough to be significant.

Mr. Veith commented on Mr. Savo's assessment that the building doesn't have residential aspects and said that perhaps Thomas was taking a different aspect - the building was very urbane with its placement in the City. It is not a gracious campus setting and it isn't like the others because it is urban.

Mr. Savo agreed and said it would have worked had he done the entire campus rather than the one main building and then the one building (Harborview Hall) that was pretty stripped down.

Ms. Sheridan pointed out that a design exists for the south building but the style changed before the bonds were passed.

Ms. Strong asked if the building was built the way designed in the Master Plan.

Mr. Savo explained that the campus plan was the Master Plan and there were at least five buildings and many of the subsequent buildings were placed where he showed them. He said there is not enough detail to show but they cut back on scale, budget and the level of architectural detail.

Ms. Wirsching asked about the level of intactness.

Mr. Savo explained that the outside is close – the windows are original and the brick and skin are intact. He said there have been mechanical additions to the back side and there used to be a bridge that connected it to the building to the north. He went over interior changes to the building including the installation of an elevator and many changes above ground level. He said the various uses of the building have prompted interior “cobbling” by various architects over time.

Public Comment:

Kristin O'Donnell did not support designation and cited three letters that were sent from Harborview Medical Center Master Plan Citizens Advisory Committee Co-Chair Larry Grouse, Yesler Terrace Community Council Leadership and one from herself (letters in DON file).

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society reminded the Board that the interior is rarely designated - it is the façade which is basically intact. She said that Harlan Thomas contributed a lot to the City. She noted that when the budget interferes with design it does impact what is built.

Mr. Abelsen explained that the Board does not look at actual use or structural integrity but focuses on the historical aspect.

Ms. Strong explained she voted to nominate the building because the construction of the building to be a nursing hall and it hearkened back to how women were housed or 'protected' and it is the only building that was built that shows a relationship to the plan. She wasn't sure but was moving toward supporting designation based on Criterion C.

Mr. Luoma supported designation based on criteria C and D but not E. He noted the cultural significance of its associations with medical practice and the community over time. He said that regardless of budget and scale there is still an architectural style that can be recognized even though it is in the shadow and is a reflection of something more significant and one can see the relationship between the two. He said it is distinctive and visible in its characteristics even though smaller in scale.

Mr. Veith went over the criteria and said the building did not meet Criterion E. He said it was not a thoroughly designed building. He noted the high quality façade facing west but said it did not follow through with the level of design on the other facades. He said the Board doesn't consider future use and noted that it is extremely common to find changes of use in a landmark building so it is not an argument against designation. He said that preserving elements of the building in a museum is not a substitute for protection of a building if it warrants it. He said he had mixed feelings about Criteria C and D and wanted to hear what other Board members said. He disagreed that the west façade was inferior and said the detailing is similar and the general character seems apparent in photos but on site it didn't feel weaker, the other facades were just plainer. With regard to C he said the building does reflect an attitude regarding how to approach assembly of a campus in an urban atmosphere.

Ms. Tremaine predicted that in a short period of time hospitals and facilities associated with them would be important as far as historic preservation goes. She said the building is not significant economically or politically but said it was culturally. She said there are more years Harborview Hall was not in use

as a residence for nurses and went on to ask how might be viewed if it was a residence for engineers or for school teachers. She said it is not distinct as an architectural style other than that it is part of the whole campus that Thomas was going to build. She noted the Master Plan and said that because only two buildings were built and it makes it more difficult that this one is a lesser design than the hospital. She noted Mr. Savo's comments about other nursing residences.

Mr. Savage did not support nomination and said it was not culturally significant.

Ms. Wirsching said it is a challenging building that is closely associated with the Center Wing and has similar physical characteristics. She said it is more worthy as part of a district than on its own. With respect to D and E she said it is not outstanding work of a designer nor is it significant because of its characteristics. With respect to C she agreed with Mr. Savage that it does not rise to that level of significance and doesn't hold its own.

Mr. Abelsen said it is not an outstanding work of Harlan Thomas. With respect to C he said it most likely meets but is not clear. With respect to D he said it worked more in a campus setting as opposed to on its own.

Mr. Veith said the buildings work as a group and noted that he was not talking about a district but about two buildings. He noted the urban context and said as it often the case to have a fine primary façade and the back and alley facades are not fine. He asked members to consider that if the building was located elsewhere would they forgive the architect for a less than thorough rendering of a non-primary façade.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of Harborview Hall, 326 Ninth Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building and the interior of the Ninth Avenue lobby.

MM/SC/AL/MT

3:4:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Abelsen, Savage, Mmes. Wirsching, Strong opposed.

091609.4 NOMINATION

091609.41 Vance Hotel
620 Stewart Street

Karin Link, Architectural Historian, presented the nomination report (full report in DON file) and provided context of the site. The ten-story building was one of the first tall buildings in the area and influenced the zoning code. It is a concrete structure with engaged piers at ground level with light cream terracotta, a granite base and buff brick and terracotta above. She pointed out the six bays noting the variation in rhythm of fenestration between the 2nd and 3rd floors. She said it is a Beaux Art Classical style with composites of classical elements and went over building details. She provided photos of the building taken in 1930 and today and went over integrity issues: new storefronts, small repeated arches 1, 2 and 6 were replaced by small arches and noted it is not uncommon for storefronts to be replaced. The terracotta remains. She mentioned that the double hung windows had been replaced with metal. She said the essential character defining elements of the exterior have been maintained and the ornamental terracotta is mostly still there. She explained that the steel structure reflects national rather than local architectural trends and noted the concrete post and beam used by local architects was still relatively new for Seattle buildings. She said the building meets Criterion D in that it embodies the Beaux Arts Classicism style and is also representative of the manner in which architecture was done in the 1920s.

She reported that architect Victor Voorhees was prolific with a wide variety of building styles; most of his work was done from 1907 – 1920. From 1907-11 he published *Western Builder* and published house plans. He increasingly became known for more than his residential work: Washington Hall, Georgetown City Hall, Washington Arms Apartment Building, the Troy Laundry, Goerig Warehouse and Uptown Theatre as well as the Hotel Vance, Lloyd Building and Vance Building which were done for Joseph Vance. She explained that the Vance Hotel was the only relatively tall building done by Voorhees. She said the building met Criterion E.

Ms. Link provided an overview of Joseph Vance and said the title block for the drawing describes the hotel as the “Hotel Building for the Vance Lumber Company”. She explained that he invested extensively in valuable property and was one of the largest owners of downtown business property in the City. Son George took over the company in 1930 and managed it until his death in 1981. She said the three buildings: Hotel Vance, the Vance and the Lloyd buildings were the early foundation of his real estate portfolio. She said the building met criteria B and C because it was associated in a significant way with Vance who was an important entrepreneur and played an important role in real estate development. She said the building was visible from many points and is stands out in its immediate neighborhood.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wirsching cited the nomination report which refers to the building as an excellent example of Beaux Arts Eclectic style and asked how it compared to others of the style in the City.

Ms. Link said that she looked at five hotels and noted the many eclectic interpretations of styles in Seattle. Asked about the arched clerestory windows Ms. Link said the original drawings appear to show plate glass and she wasn't sure if it was built like that. The photo showing the plate glass transoms at the end is from the 1930s. Asked about the additional bay at the west end Ms. Link noted that things often were not symmetrical.

Mr. Veith said it looks irregular until one finds the intended center at the entry and then the organization of glazing makes sense. He asked why they chose not to have another double window at the end bay and Ms. Link noted there was no trace why it was done that way.

Mr. Luoma noted that Ms. Link described Mr. Voorhees as a notable designer and asked if this was his only hotel.

Ms. Link noted his residential work but wasn't aware of other hotels or any 10-11 story buildings designed by him in downtown Seattle and added that she didn't know how many tall buildings like this that he did. She said he seemed to be homegrown as an architect in Seattle and was trained as a lawyer.

Mr. Veith noted that some described Voorhees as a "high average" architect with a few outstanding buildings and asked Ms. Link why this would be considered outstanding.

Mr. Link said it represents a culmination – it is a major city building and that he didn't do that many. She noted the value of high style vernacular which shouldn't be lost.

Ms. Wirsching asked if it was a residential hotel.

Ms. Link stated it was a true hotel – a second tier hotel rather than a luxury hotel.

Mr. Veith said the pattern of the large and small windows is typical of apartment building and this building is a hotel. He said it seemed unusual to do large and small windows which could indicate that he didn't think out the bay size doing an accidental approach to design.

Rob Mawson, Heritage Consulting, presented on behalf of the owner. He went over the criteria and said the Vance Hotel had no integrity and there was insufficient documentation to justify nomination. He said that Vance was not

important to Seattle. He said the 1920s was an incredible time of construction in Seattle and noted many important buildings including the Medical Dental Building, Dexter Horton Building and the Northern Life Tower to which the Vance Building doesn't compare. He said Vance was not a defining individual in the City and the hotel was not significantly associated with him. He said the building was not significant to the economy and was a 2nd tier hotel at the time. He said that four of the six bays were dedicated to six tenants and that there was no dining room and no meeting space. The hotel was one of 500 hotels in the City at the time.

He said the building is an amalgam of styles and said that Beaux Arts Eclecticism is not a style. He said the building was just an investment and was not exemplary, distinctive or unusual. He said it was a typical commercial building of the 1920s. He said the most dramatic design element of the building was the entry which is gone and noted the alterations to the interior and exterior.

He said with regard to D the building is not comparable to others such as the Exchange Building. With regard to E it is not outstanding – it is not a good design not does it have integrity. He said Voorhees was a residential designer who publishes plan books and he said there is not a comprehensive look at what makes him a significant designer. With regard to F is it not landmark quality work and it doesn't stand out.

Board Questions:

Ms. Tremaine asked what the relationship between Vance and Voorhees was.

Mr. Mawson said they may have met through church association noting that Voorhees did a lot of work in West Seattle which is dominated by Catholic Church. He said Vance as a patron escalated Voorhees to more prominent commissions.

Asked about “second-tier” hotel Mr. Mawson explained that hotels in this era served a broad spectrum. Many people lived in hotels and he said that some were upscale flats but with the lobby and dining room. On the other end were the transient hotels - patronized by seamen and loggers – that also provide ill-repute vices. He said this hotel wasn't a first-class respectable hotel. He said it is a commercial style, a respectable and humble building.

Eric Laschever, counsel for the owner, noted the relevance of the description of this hotel as “second-tier” with respect to Criterion C and “significant economic merits” that it was the classy hotels that made Seattle a destination. He said it was one of 500 hotels that didn't have prominence so is not associated significantly with the economy.

John Tess, Heritage Consulting, said it was an infill property and a common building. He said there are integrity issues and it is not a significant building. He said Vance had an ego and liked to put his name on things and that this was just an investment property. He said it doesn't meet the criteria.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma noted the description of the hotel as "utilitarian" and that it was not flamboyant. He said the appeal to the façade was intentional by the owner and although it diminishes the building architecturally it may strengthen relationship between client and architect. He also expressed interest in hearing more about the relationship between Vance and Voorhees.

Mr. Veith said the building was typical of Voorhees and again said it was a "high average" building. He had doubts but noted he always noticed the building when passing. He said that the building doesn't meet Criterion F but the fact that he always noticed it prompts due diligence to look further so he supported nomination.

Ms. Strong did not support nomination noting the building was neither distinctive nor significant.

Ms. Wirsching said the building is attractive and noticeable but doesn't rise to the Criteria. She said it is not outstanding nor is it an outstanding work of the designer.

Mr. Savage said it is an average and typical building and would not support nomination.

Mr. Abelsen noted difficulty with Criterion D and the difficulty in embracing a style. He said he liked some features but was concerned with the loss of integrity with the windows. He said it is not an outstanding work of Voorhees who was best known for houses and said that the Troy Laundry was one of his best. He said he leaned toward not nomination but agreed that a tour would be helpful.

Action: I move approval of the Vance Hotel at 620 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 October 21, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/TV/MT

3:4:0 Motion failed. Mmes. Strong, Wirsching, Messrs. Savage and Abelson opposed.

091609.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

091609.51 Sorrento Hotel
900 Madison St.

Ms. Chave went over the Controls and Incentives agreement and explained that David Peterson did an historic element survey and the owners wanted it acknowledged in the Controls and Incentives agreement. She said that is why there are so many exclusions and things deferred to staff review. She noted an element not listed in the survey is the extrusion/alteration that will be deferred to staff review: “alterations to the masonry vestibule addition that extends from the south side of the north wing at the courtyard level”.

Jon Burke, owner, noted the non-original walled off area was a wine cellar and that they are trying to strike the balance to preserve the historic elements but to also keep the hotel functional.

Mr. Veith asked if alterations to certain components of the Fireside Room including the paneling and light fixtures were not original.

Ms. Chave noted all changes have been documented and the Hunt Club was not included.

Mr. Abelsen noted the thorough and studied historic element survey.

Action: I move to accept the Controls and Incentives agreement for the Sorrento Hotel at 900 Madison Street.

MM/SC/MT/TV

7:0:0 Motion carried.

091609.52 (former) Seventh Church of Christ, Scientist
2555 8th Ave W

Ms. Chave explained the request for a two month extension.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the (former) Seventh Church of Christ, Scientist for a period of two months.

MM/SC/TV/MS

7:0:0 Motion carried.

091609.53 Wilsonian Apartments

4700-4720 University Way NE

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Wilsonian Apartments for a period of two months.

MM/SC/TV/MT

7:0:0 Motion carried.

091609.54 Carmack House
1522 E. Jefferson Street

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a thirty day extension and that she has been in contact with the owner's representative who shared with her that Historic Seattle is searching for a site to move the house to.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Carmack House for a period of thirty days.

MM/SC/TV/SS

7:0:0 Motion carried.

091609.55 Eitel Building
1501 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the request for an extension to the second meeting in November and said that documents have been submitted for review.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Eitel Building until the second meeting in November.

MM/SC/TV/MW

7:0:0 Motion carried.

091609.6 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Chave noted the (former) 7th Church of Christ fundraising event on October 2, 2009.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, reported on the "A Sacred Place" event and said the Church was actively fundraising for improvements to the building.

091609.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator