



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB427/09

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday August 19, 2009 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Stephen Lee  
Marie Strong  
Tom Veith  
Christine Howard  
Mark Hannum  
Sean Peterfreund  
Meredith Wirsching  
Steve Savage

### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Alyce Conti  
Mollie Tremaine  
Vern Abelson

### **081909.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meeting of July 15, 2009

MM/SC/MH/TV

6:0:2 Minutes approved as amended.

### **081909.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

081909.21 Washington Athletic Club  
1325 Sixth Avenue

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"

Proposed new business signage and storefront alterations

Jack McCullough introduced the application and noted the Washington Athletic Club's support.

Dave de Verona, owner of Blue Water Taco Grill provided an overview of his company. He introduced designer Ken Barnes who would describe the proposal.

Mr. Barnes explained they have two versions to propose and proceeded to go over them.

Ms. Sordt asked the applicant to go through each element and explain exactly what is proposed for the signs, the canopy, and for the storefront alterations.

Mr. Barnes explained that polystyrene lettering (4" thick) on a one inch spacer will be mounted on the building with a silicone adhesive. The letters don't weigh much and he said they would not be drilling holes to mount them. He said that Mr. de Verona had tested the adhesive on the façade to demonstrate that it is removable without compromising the finish. He explained that all their materials are connected to the solid panels of the window system. He said the front façade is just the same and showed the solid panels that exist already and that their shutters will be mounted to those. He said the window mullions are painted; the door will get a finish on it and pointed out panels that would get finish applied. He went on to describe their signage and said the blade sign will be non-illuminated and is located on the vertical seam so the mounting is on a seam.

Mr. Barnes went on to explain that two interior pieces of signage are illuminated. The awning is similar in configuration to the awning at the bank at the other end of the building; he said it will be mounted only to the grout seams both vertically and horizontally. He said the material matches the building standard. He said brackets that were on the inside have been removed from the proposal. He said the spotlights are to be mounted on the awning.

Mr. Lee asked the applicant to explain their preferred scheme.

Mr. Barnes said that they prefer Option 2.

Mr. Lee asked if originally they had planned to apply the bricks directly onto the building.

Mr. Barnes said they now would prefer the paint treatment.

Mr. Lee said that there is no change to the fabric of the building except a layer of paint.

Mr. Barnes agreed and added that the shutters are mounted to the building but are on cletes.

Mr. McCullough said that one of the directions the WAC gave is that they want to leave the building façade historically intact. He reiterated WAC support for the application and explained they had talked with the applicant on finding a balance on their trade dress that dials it back from the normal installation. He said that everything they propose to install is completely removable without damaging the building.

Ms. Sodt said she understood that the WAC is working with Pioneer Masonry to repair the holes that are in the terra cotta.

Mike Young, Chief Engineer at WAC, said he has been working with Pioneer Masonry and the WAC had come up with an idea to start from here on to specify the attachment methods of anything that is attached to the building. He said they found a product that is very easy to repair, restore; it is an epoxy system that does not use any permanent mounting on the building itself. It glues a mounting rod to the building itself. At time of restoration, to remove the mounting, the end of the rod is heated to the point of failure of the epoxy and the rod will pull out leaving a relatively clean hole that is very easy for Pioneer Masonry to restore.

Mr. McCullough said they are trying to set up a prototype and are using this application as a guinea pig.

Board Questions:

Ms. Strong asked about the area below the window on Union.

Mr. Barnes said it is an attempt that someone had made to replicate the original terra cotta.

Ms. Sodt said it isn't original but it is old and it terra cotta material

Ms. Strong expressed concern with the precedent the awning sets for variations on a theme when you are trying to consistently maintain continuity for the building facades. She asked the applicant if they entertained a different style of awning that stayed in line with the more one-dimensional style that is already there.

Mr. Lee asked why the applicant decided the existing awning wasn't workable.

Mr. Barnes said it eclipses the front of the building and he said they will have dimensional letters with spotlights on them that will look nice or they will have just white painted letters on an awning which doesn't have anything to do with their identity. He pointed out the awning is rain protection for pedestrians. He said it is a prominent corner and it can be seen from a distance and the impact will be profound.

Ms. Strong explained she wasn't questioning the lettering but more the multiple levels or sections of the awning which seems to be a break from the other awnings that exist. She said the space itself is already a colorful "pop" and that she thought it would be too much going on.

Mr. Barnes went over the concept for the design. He explained it is one awning that is made into three visual sections but said they were trying to be as flexible as possible and that not having the awning would be a departure for them.

Mr. Barnes said as a mid-block location it has some design challenges because it is only 14'.

Ms. Wirsching pointed out on Page 2 of the packet it shows the elevation with the awnings and said it is a departure from the awnings that are already on the rest of the elevations. She said this awning balances what is on the other end and thought it was somewhat similar to what was approved previously.

Ms. Strong noted it is similar in that it has the lettering above and it is lower than the other one but reiterated her concern with the three different heights.

Mr. Veith asked if the fish had been moved down.

Mr. Barnes said it did not but the awnings moved up a bit.

Mr. McCullough said they would like to move forward because they are ready to go.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee stated that the first time he saw this he thought it was the most shockingly colorful and incompatible thing he has ever seen on a building. However, he noted that it is a layer of paint and that he thought they had been very clever in double-sticking this onto the corner of the building.

Ms. Wirsching noted a lot of the comment at ARC was that though it is visually jarring it is removable and it is part of a storefront system and not part of the base building that is surrounding. She said it is removable and it is an element that is inserted into the storefront that is not itself historic so it seems a reasonable response to the storefront system. She said the main concern with the awning and the sign were the method of attachment and noted that they are being attached into the grout lines.

Mr. Lee observed that most members preferred no faux brick.

Mr. Veith preferred Option 2 and that the visual appearance to the rest of the storefront other than the awning does give one the “found object” feeling and he said as long as they aren’t impacting the frame and were only dealing with the unoriginal components of the openings. He said he would have preferred that the awning had been supported off of the storefront system rather than the façade of the building itself. He went over the attachment details and said the Board has approved attachments to the grout lines before and said if they can do this without breaking the façade tiles then ok. He said the awning itself, in contrast to the rest, looks very contrived and artificial. He said he thought it would be better if it were simpler and noted the applicant said he would be open to change it. He suggested having only a single element that went across with the custom support system. He supported Option 2 and wanted to see the awning simplified. He expressed concern about the adhesive - that a short term test might not be a predictor of a long-term result although that would not prevent him from supporting the application.

Other Board members agreed that a simpler awning would work better with the context of this building. The applicant agreed to come back.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations, signage and lighting as delineated in Option 2 of the owner’s application with the exception that the applicant shall return to ARC for final approval of the design of the awning.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 122948 as the proposed work does not irreversibly 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.

Ms. Wirsching amended the motion to indicate the Option 2 is the one recommended for approval.

MM/SC/MW/CH  
MM/SC/TV/CH

8:0:0 Motion on amendment carried.  
8:0:0 Motion carried.

081909.22 Coca Cola Bottling Plant  
1313 E. Columbia St.  
Proposed temporary trailer

Ms. Chave explained the proposed would have minimal impact on the landmark building since it will not be attached.

Joy Jacobsen, Seattle University, noted the trailer would be placed next to the least visible elevation of the building; she also said it will be temporary.

Ms. Chave said the trailer would straddle the site – part of it is on the landmarked site and part of it is off. If it were to be moved west to a totally non-landmarked site it would be more visible.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee said it was a straightforward proposal.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed temporary trailer, as per the applicant's submittal. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Controls and Incentives Agreement as the proposed trailer does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, and the proposed trailer can easily be removed without harming the historic structure, as per Standard #10 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/MW/SS

8:0:0 Motion carried.

**081909.3 DESIGNATION**

081909.31 The Kenney Seaview Building  
7125 Fauntleroy Way SW

*Mr. Savage recused himself.*

Chuck Madwell, Davis Wright Tremaine, introduced Kenney CEO Kevin McFeely. He also introduced David Peterson, architectural consultant with Nicholson Kovalchick Architects, who prepared the nomination report. Mr. Madwell said the Kenney supported designation of the Seaview Building specifically calling out the unaltered portions of the exterior of the original 3-story building.

David Peterson went over the nomination report (report available in DON file) and provided an overview of the history of retirement homes in Seattle. He said while there wasn't a lot of information available he noted the Norse Home on Phinney Ridge, which was founded by the Norwegian community. He said the idea was incorporated in 1934 but it wasn't built until 1955 when they were able to get the funds. He noted the Hearthstone Community built by the Lutheran Church in Seattle which was conceived in the 1950s but wasn't built until 1964. He also noted Bayview on Queen Anne which was established by the First Methodist Church in 1961.

Mr. Peterson explained how the Kenney buildings and the site have changed over time. He noted a 1912 article by Herbert Crowley "The Buildings of Seattle, City of Great Architectural Promise" in which the earliest photo he could find of the building is included. He noted how much more architecturally striking the tower is because it was more ornamented than it is today: four urn shaped finials in the upper portion next to the cupola; the lower portion of the tower has quoins; there is a large circular element in the center of the lowest part of the tower; and the balustrade. He said that none of these elements are there today. He presented photos over time to develop a timeframe as to when certain elements disappeared or were added.

Mr. Peterson said that the Seaview Building was occupied in 1909 and the third floor was still not complete. He pointed out site details such as the clear cut landscape, a flagpole, a ramp coming down from the porch, and he noted there was not much in the way of plantings. He noted that architecturally it is a great example of Colonial Revival and said Independence Hall was the inspiration for the building. The next photo he presented was from 1946 which shows that the balustrade is still there but the urns, the quoins and the circular elements were gone. The balustrade is gone in a 1958 photo. By the 1960s additional trees had been added along with shrub and benches along the path. He pointed out that the site has changed continuously over time and stated that the south porch was demolished in 1957-58. He said with the 1960s additions the Denny wing was added to the Sunrise building. He said a circular garden/walking area was added in the 1960s-70s and that some shrubs

and trees were gone. He said the Ballymena Building was constructed in 1985, replacing the circular garden.

Mr. Peterson noted the Staff Recommendation no longer included interiors but went over additions to the building: the dining room, stair tower and the south elevation addition and noted it was not remarkable architecturally. He said the exterior of the two-story service wing has changed over time and reiterated the porch on the south side was demolished in the 1950s. He said that neither the first floor stairway nor the lobby were exceptional.

Mr. Peterson said that in his opinion the building did not meet Criteria A or B but did meet C because the original Kenney Building was directly associated with the establishment of one of the earliest elder facilities in Seattle's history. He said it meets Criterion D because of its Colonial Revival Architecture and 20<sup>th</sup> Century Eclectism for Seattle. He said it meets Criterion E because it is an outstanding work of Graham and Myers. He said it might meet Criterion F because it is visible from the ferry and Lincoln Park although he wouldn't put it in the category of a dramatically visual landmark. He suggested the exterior of the exterior of the original 3-story Seaview building meets all the criteria he mentioned but not the two-story wing because there has been much change over time. He was not supportive of designating the site because of the changes over time and said it is not a great example of English landscape style. He was not supportive of designating the additions to the original building and the interiors because the additions detract from the integrity of the original building and the interiors are not exceptional.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if Mr. Peterson knew the date for the landscaping on the west side of the building.

Responding to Board questions about the landscaping Mr. Peterson said the drive aisle with circular portion was done in 1985 and said that some trees might be from the 1960s.

Mr. Veith asked about the stair and railings.

Mr. Peterson said the stair coming down from the entry with the railings dates back to around 1946: it was seen in the 1946 photo.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation based on Criteria C, D, and F. She did not support E because she did not think it

was an outstanding work of the architects. She noted that the landscape has changed over time but thought the site was important and lends to the prominence of the building. She did not support additions or additional buildings.

Mr. Peterfreund supported nomination based on Criteria C, D, and F and did not support Criterion E. He supported designation of the entire site and asked about the gardens to the west.

Ms. Chave noted the struggle with the site description because of the legal description – that it is one parcel so it is difficult to separate out specific areas. She suggested designation of the site and that Staff would work with the owner on Controls and Incentives.

Mr. Hannum agreed with the Staff Report and supported C, D, and F. He said it is prominent in West Seattle. He supported designation of the site. He noted the importance of the west gardens and the establishment of a community for the aged and the grounds for residents' gardening and walking.

Ms. Strong agreed with the Staff Report and supported C and D but noted she was “on the fence” with F. She agreed the gardens to the west should be included and noted the photos of people working in the gardens. She mentioned that the building is prominent when flying over West Seattle.

Ms. Howard supported designation based on C, D, and F and thanked the owners and presenter for the thorough research.

Mr. Veith agreed with the Staff Report and said that while Criterion E was an acceptable component, it was not necessary. He supported Criterion F and said that controlling the site is important because changes to the site even on the east would affect its character and prominence. He said the north dining room is simple and plain and he considered it a most appropriate addition in scale and design. He said he was satisfied with the motion as it was written and said he definitely supported C, D, and F and maybe E.

Mr. Lee agreed with the staff report and supported Criterion C, D, and F and said that F was relevant. He supported including the site.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Kenney Seaview Building at 7125 Fauntleroy Way SW a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the nomination report; 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 Seaview Building, excluding the following:  
The 1959 south addition,

The 1964 north dining room addition, and  
The 1964 enclosed exterior stairway addition

- The site, excluding the following:  
The Sunrise Building,  
The Ballymena Building,  
The Lincoln Vista Building, and  
Temporary sheds and greenhouses

MM/SC/MH/CH

7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Savage  
recused himself.

#### **081909.4 NOMINATIONS**

081909.41 Baroness Apartments  
1005 Spring Street

*Mr. Veith recused himself.*

Gary Kaplan, CEO, Virginia Mason, provided an overview and history of Virginia Mason. He pointed out that while they support nomination of the Baroness and Rhododendron Apartment buildings they did not support nomination of the Chasselton. He said the location of the Chasselton is critical to the future planning of the campus. He introduced Susan Boyle and Sonia Sokol- Fürész of BOLA Architects, Peter Steinbrueck and Tom Walsh.

Susan Boyle went over the nomination report (full report in DON file) and provided an overview of the First Hill neighborhood. She explained it was the one of the first residential areas in Seattle. She said roads were created in the 1880s and noted the mansion type development through the turn of the century. She said that the City got its first water in this area and noted the name “Spring” Street so named for the many springs on the hill. She provided context of the neighborhood went over apartment buildings in the area and noted the significant number. She noted the change from a neighborhood of mansions and wide tree-lined streets to the 1920s boom in apartment building construction and the increase over time of the addition of major institutions: clubs, churches and hospitals.

She said the six-story Baroness Apartment building, located at Terry and Spring, is constructed of reinforced concrete. She pointed out that the marquee on the north side is no longer there. She said it was designed by James Shack of Shack, Young and Myers, and built as an apartment/hotel – first floor had special features that distinguish it as having the hotel component: a dining room, kitchen, lobby, lounge, slight stair up to niche, a fireplace and an elevator. She pointed out the typical floor is a single double loaded corridor with rooms on either side; 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor “echelon”

apartments which distinguished them from the 4<sup>th</sup> floor “regular” apartment units. She said all units are small cleverly planned to integrate tiny kitchens and bathrooms.

She went over exterior elements and noted the abstract rusticated concrete base, the verticality emphasized of the outer bays with cast stone ornamentation. She noted the Art Deco motifs were based on ferns, cacti, some sea-life abstracted forms. She explained that the exterior walls step 14” to 8” as they go up and noted the intact exterior facades. She pointed out the contrast between the strong horizontality and verticality on the west façade. She said the sign was not in place in 1907. She noted the cast stone ornament on the west-most bay on the south façade along the drive aisle. The alley elevation is stucco-clad. She noted the rusticated brick patterning at the outer corner, the detailed zig zag pattern and the beautifully detailed parapets. She proceeded to go over window details and pointed out the steel sash windows and single glazed operating original windows. She said the building is very intact with a few exceptions one being the entry way to former doctors’ offices off west entry. She pointed out the main entry is distinguished by the faceting in the cast stone and original there was one door with a relite and presently there is a double door within a new aluminum frame assembly. She said the sconce lighting is original. The building was developed as an apartment hotel and run as such until 2005. She said Virginia Mason purchased it and it was rehabbed in 2005 – and pointed out the designers used and adapted the original stencil motif; they made new openings in the lounge area but kept the faceted opening.

Ms. Boyle went over the Art Deco stylistic features and provided examples of other local Art Deco buildings (Northern Life Building and the US Marine Hospital). She provided examples of other works of James Shack: the former United Methodist Church, Seattle of Commerce, and the Civic Auditorium. She said he was a very notable architect.

Peter Steinbrueck went over the Criteria and said the building meets D, E, F and maybe C. The building was built in the 1930 and was first identified as a potential landmark in the 1975 First Hill Inventory of Buildings: an Urban Design Resource, Seattle Historic Sites Inventory, several state inventory and has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places by the Washington State of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. With regard to Criterion D he said the noted the Art Deco features and the high quality exhibited on this building. He explained the style was popular for a relatively short period of time and distinctive features include the verticality, a stepped parapet, rich ornamentation, decorative relief, and abstract geometric motifs and zig zag patterning. He said the building is largely original in character including its original steel sash and it possesses a quality of craftsmanship and construction built of quality reinforced concrete and masonry and has been well-maintained.

With regard to Criterion E Mr. Steinbrueck said this is one of only two extant buildings built by Shack and noted its distinctive quality; he said it is a gem, a rarity in Seattle. He went on to say the building meets Criterion F because it is an easily identifiable feature and it important in its historic context. He cited a letter of support to the Landmarks Board from Professor Emeritus Norm Johnson (letter in DON file).

Public Comment:

Jim Erickson, First Hill Improvement Association, said the Baroness is historically significant and important to the neighborhood and is representative of the hotel/apartment era. He said it is structurally sound and viable and accessible to the public. He noted it is an affordable place to stay while relatives are in the hospital. He supported Virginia Mason's vision to protect the building and the corner.

Bob Anderson, Horizon House, submitted a letter and said First Hill is home to seniors/elders. He said he valued the tradition and style of the building. He commended Virginia Mason for taking the initiative to preserve it. He supported nomination.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching agreed with the Staff Report and supported nomination based on D and E. She said the building was interesting, refined and elegant and that it is a representative example of Shack's work. She noted the strong Art Deco motif and elements and the eclecticism of the design because the rusticated base doesn't quite fit with Art Deco. She said the steel sash windows are readily apparent on buildings of this era. She noted the number of apartment type houses in the neighborhood and questioned why it was not a district.

Mr. Peterfreund agreed with the Staff Report and noted the integrity of details. He said the concrete base is replicated in a lot of the mixed use buildings on Capital Hill.

Ms. Sodt explained she looked at the interior and noted it was too altered and although it was beautifully decorated inside it was not original.

Mr. Hannum supported nomination and said the building was eclectic and distinctive. He noted its fine quality of elements and said the fenestration made it seem more refined.

Ms. Strong agreed with the Staff Report and supported nomination based on Criteria D and E and expressed interest in Criterion F because of its location on the corner.

Ms. Howard supported nomination and noted its striking Art Deco elements particularly in the verticality and the fineness of decoration.

Mr. Lee supported nomination based on D and E but did not support F. He said it is a beautiful example of Art Deco and is worthy of landmark status.

Action: I move approval of the Baroness Apartments at 1005 Spring 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 7, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MS/MH

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

081909.42

Rhododendron Apartments/Inn at Virginia Mason  
1006 Spring Street

Sonia Sokol Fürész presented the nomination report (report in DON file) and provided context of the building at Spring and Terry. Terry has been vacated between Spring and Seneca for hospital use by Virginia Mason as has an alley that ran along the east side of the building. She explained the 8-9 story building was completed in 1928 of reinforced concrete columns and floors, hollow clay tile infill walls. Primary facades are finished with variegated brown brick veneer and cast stone details while secondary facades are plain brick. The exterior remains largely unaltered. A clipping from The Washington Architect at time of building referred to the building as “one of the most modern of the time”. She pointed out the primary south and west facades are arranged in the classical composition of base, shaft and cap with the first story base clad with cast stone; the shaft, composed of the 2<sup>nd</sup> through the 7<sup>th</sup> stories and the cap comprised of the 8<sup>th</sup> story and parapet. The shaft is divided from the base and cap by a band of patterned brick. The main entrance is centered on the south façade is emphasized by a slight projection that is carried up the full height of the building. The entrance itself is recessed and slightly above grade; within the entry vestibule are decorative glazed tiles. She noted detailing on the south façade: the cast stone base, the zig zag pattern brick band above, and the original windows at the lower stories. Other decorative details include the cast stone quoining and banding as well as the diamond pattern brick band that separates the shaft from the cap. She noted gothic revival influences suggested by the finials at the parapet and at the

penthouse but overall the building composition is stylistically eclectic. She explained that the “H” shield on the parapet is for designer and original owner John H. Hudson. She went over exterior features: the garden courtyard and roof terrace and provided views of the interior lobby and dining area. The leaded glass doors that open onto the courtyard are original. Between the dining room and the corridor are leaded glass windows which have a rhododendron detail on the stained glass. The entry way lobby’s patterned terrazzo, marble base, crown moulding and woodwork were noted. The building had 79 apartments, 37 one room, 21 two-room, 20 three-room and the five-room penthouse. Smaller units were arranged along the north side of the building with the two and three-room larger units along the south and west. Some of the larger apartments have been divided into smaller hotel units. Units are arranged along a double loaded corridor served by a stair and elevator near the “L” intersection and a stair and freight elevator located at the east end of the building. She said some original wood panel doors and cabinetry remain.

Ms. Sokol Fürész said John H. Hudson was the developer and Hudson along with H. G. Hammond are listed on the drawings as architects. Hudson was born in 1879 in Minnesota and came to Seattle in 1923. He went on to become a Seattle builder, businessman and apartment building owner. He and his brother, Harry, formed a design company and were responsible for five bungalows built north of Woodland Park in 1912 and they worked on joint projects into the 1920s. The Rhododendron was not a joint project. She said that Hudson’s construction business focused primarily on apartment buildings on Capital Hill and First Hill in the 1910s and 20s. Apartment building styles usually featured revival styles such as Tudor, Gothic, Jacobean and Colonial.

Peter Steinbrueck went over the Criteria and said the building met D and E and maybe F. He said with regard to D, the style isn’t fully expressed but noted the quality of design as a representative apartment designed for middle class urban living at that time. He cited a report by Mimi Sheridan on this period in Seattle and noted the number of multi-family apartments for working people of modest to middle-income. He referred to the style as “eclectic revivalist”. He noted the penthouse, rooftop terraces, refined details and garden court. He said the architectural integrity has been preserved and few alterations have been made.

Mr. Steinbrueck said that Hudson designed and built a number of apartments on First Hill and that this was one of his finer local examples of apartment building. He said the mini-grouping of buildings doesn’t rise to the level of an historic district and he noted the four corners: Virginia Mason Hospital, the Baroness Apartments, the Rhododendron and the John S. Alden. He noted the building’s sibling relationship to the Baroness and the way the facades face off. He quoted letters from Norm Johnson and Larry Kreisman sent to the

Landmarks Board (letters in file). He said the building contributes significantly to the First Hill neighborhood.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wirsching recommended revising the nomination to include the Gothic Revival style.

Asked if the rhododendron glazed tiles were original to the building Ms. Sokol Fürész said there is no reason to think they aren't.

Public Comment:

Jim Erickson reiterated his earlier comments on the Baroness Apartments and supported nomination. He noted the Rhododendron is valued by area seniors as a place to meet.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Howard supported nomination and agreed with Mr. Steinbrueck's description of the building as "eclectic revivalist". She said it is well preserved and it typifies the period even without a style. She agreed with the Staff Report.

Ms. Strong supported nomination based on D and thanked Virginia Mason for its stewardship. She echoed earlier support for an historic district.

Mr. Hannum noted that while he was less impressed with this building than he was with the Baroness, as an ensemble it gains strength. He said it is intact and has integrity and he supported nomination based on Criterion D.

Mr. Peterfreund agreed with the Staff Report and supported nomination based on Criterion D.

Ms. Wirsching agreed with the Staff Report and supported nomination based on Criterion D. She said the building does not appear to meet Criterion C, but said it is an interesting piece of history in relation to Henry Hudson and what he developed in the city. She said it is not outstanding work of his but is representative of his body of work. With regard to Criterion E she said Hudson is credited as the designer and builder but she thought there are others that more representative as body of his work.

Mr. Lee said it was a good example of the era although not significant. He questioned why this wasn't an historic district.

Ms. Wirsching agreed and said there are great pieces of fabric of the neighborhood and it might make more sense to look at it as a district in order to help preserve character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Lee did not support nomination because he didn't think the building was significant.

Action: I move approval of the Rhododendron Apartments at 1006 Spring Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation the exterior of the building, the interior of the main entry lobby, and the site, that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for October 7, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MW/CH                      5:1:1 Motion carried. Mr. Lee opposed and Mr. Veith recused himself.

081909.43      Chasselton Apartments  
1017 Boren Avenue

Susan Boyle presented the nomination report (full report in DON file) and explained the five-story building was constructed in 1925. The first floor fills the full site and the upper stories are L-shaped. The building is wood framed with brick veneer and cast stone cladding. She said the building is intact and noted that in the late 1940s Boren Avenue expanded, narrowing the sidewalk creating an abrupt entry way experience. She said the five-story building has two primary facades and described the enframing trim around the exterior bays. She noted the eclectic character with Tudor Revival qualities. The masonry at the base has been painted. She went over the windows and said that on the alley facade 70% replaced with aluminum frame. She went over exterior details and said the Tudor Revivalist stylistic characteristics are clustered around window and door openings. She pointed out the typical surround with cast stone and quoining treatment and the draped piece at the top. She noted the slight arched head opening at the original entrance. She said the entry is distinguished by the original wood assembly with pointed arches.

Ms. Boyle noted the special amenity spaces on the first floor specifically the original concierge space which has been enclosed. She went over lobby features including terrazzo flooring, marble wainscoting, and decorative plaster work. She said the corridors leading from the first floor have low arched head openings and the ones on the upper floors are relatively plain. She said the building originally had 62 units, 55 of which are two room units which had efficient elements such as Murphy beds. She noted the original glazed panel doors, cabinets, fixtures and fittings.

Ms. Boyle noted Ms. Sokol Fürész provided information on John Hudson earlier. She went on to provide photo examples of the Tudor Revival Style in the area. She said the buildings tend to be embellished with cast stone or glazed terracotta to emulate the original Tudor or Jacobean stonework. She said decorative elements are typically clustered around windows the bays and entries. She said it is a common style.

Peter Steinbrueck said The Chasselton doesn't meet the threshold requirements and said there are no convincing facts to support. He said there is no historic or cultural association and it was not listed in historic sites listing for First Hill. He said it meets no design criteria and said it is a typical 1920s building with no significant, rare or unusual association. He said it is relatively undistinguished with no unusual qualities. He cited Norm Johnson's letter to the Board (letter in DON file). He said the integrity is compromised with 70% of the double hung wood sash windows replaced. He said there are other superior examples in the neighborhood citing the Alden and the Rhododendron Apartments. He said it is identifiable at Boren and Spring but the contributory requirement is not met. The widening of Boren Avenue negatively impacted the site. He said it did not meet any criteria and is a typical not noteworthy building.

Tom Walsh said Virginia Mason is committed to Historic Preservation and that they nominated the two buildings (the Baroness and the Rhododendron buildings) to preserve them. They do not support nomination of the Chasselton Building. He cited the letter to the Board from Norm Johnson and reiterated comments from the presenters and said the Chasselton did not meet criteria for nomination.

Board Questions:

Ms. Strong asked if the windows are original.

Ms. Sokol Fürész said the third story and above have been replaced with vinyl but are consistent with the original profile; the first and second floors are original.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said the building is not distinguished or unique. She said it is interesting in the neighborhood and part of the social network but is more representative than unique.

Mr. Peterfreund said its being sited on Boren Avenue adds to historic character of the neighborhood – and it is the most visible of the three building - but that on its own it is not worthy. He did not support nomination.

Mr. Hannum supported nomination and said the building always catches his eye. It is simple yet elegant and represents a mid-rise building composition more than others in the neighborhood. H said it lost neighbors on Boren – contextually it still in an ensemble. He noted the windows that were replaced are on a non-primary façade so it has the ability to convey its significance and its integrity.

Ms. Strong supported nomination and requested a tour of the three buildings. She said it is a challenge to believe it is a significant building but agreed with Mr. Hannum that it does “pop out”. She wants to review further.

Ms. Howard thanked the presenters and said it was a more typical building which embodies the characteristics of the period but is not outstanding. She supported nomination to allow time to review more thoroughly.

Mr. Lee said it is less significant than the Rhododendron and he would not support it.

Action: I move approval of the Chasselton Apartments at 1017 Boren Avenue 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 the interior of the Boren Avenue main entry lobby, that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for October 7, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MS/MH

3:3:1 Motion denied. Ms. Wirsching, Mr. Peterfreund and Mr. Lee opposed. Mr. Veith recused himself.

*Mr. Peterfreund left at 6:50 p.m.*

## **081909.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

081909.51 Egan House  
1500 Lakeview Boulevard E.

Ms. Chave went presented the signed agreement with Historic Seattle.

Action: I move to approve the signed Controls and Incentives Agreement for the Egan House at 1500 Lakeview Boulevard E.

MM/SC/CH/TV 6:0:0 Motion carried.

081909.52 Japanese Language School  
1414 S. Weller St.

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

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Japanese Language School at 1414 S. Weller St. for a period of thirty (30) days.

MM/SC/MH/CH 6:0:0 Motion carried.

081909.53 Garfield High School  
400 23<sup>rd</sup> Ave

Ms. Chave went over the request for a six-month extension.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for Garfield High School at 40 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue for a period of six months.

MM/SC/TV/CH 6:0:0 Motion carried.

081909.54 Fitch-Nutt House  
4401 Phinney Avenue N.

Jessica Clawson, representing the owner, explained the request for a 60-day extension.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives at the Fitch-Nutt House for 60 days.

MM/SC/TV/CH 6:0:0 Motion carried.

081909.55 Carmack House  
1522 East Jefferson Street  
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt went over the request for a one month extension.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Carmack House at 1522 East Jefferson Street for one month.

MM/SC/TV/CH 6:0:0 Motion carried.

**081909.6 BOARD BUSINESS**

**081909.7 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator