



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 406/09

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4080
Wednesday, August 5, 2009 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Stephen Lee, Chair
Marie Strong
Tom Veith
Mollie Tremaine
Christine Howard
Mark Hannum
Steve Savage
Meredith Wirsching
Alyce Conti

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Vernon Abelsen
Sean Peterfreund

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

080509.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of July 1, 2009
MM/SC/MT/MS

7:0:2 Minutes approved as amended.
Mr. Lee and Ms. Howard abstained.

080509.2 CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

080509.21 Brasa/Metropolitan Printing Press
2107 Third Avenue
Proposed wall sign

Ms. Sodt provided handouts and asked the applicant if he provided the drawing corrections about the attachment.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Dave Pidgeon replied that he brought the adjusted statement and said the correction on the drawing was just indicating there was a bolt with a nut on it. He went over the proposal and explained that there is a pre-existing painted-on wall sign and the use is grandfathered. He said that Brasa will advertise products that are carried inside and that the ARC approved. Per ARC request he included a sentence in the documents that speaks to that the sign framework that is being put on the building is sufficient to hold the vinyl banner sign. ARC also requested that on the engineering drawings of how the sign attached and explained there is a J-bolt that is used to tension down vinyl and it is tensioned with a nut. He said the tension nut on the bottom of the J-bolt is missing. He pointed out an “okay” on the engineered drawings indicates the framework is sufficient and will support the sign. He reiterated that he has a statement that the framework is adequate and would provide that.

Ms. Sodt explained that at ARC Mr. Abelsen looked it over the engineering and thought it adequate but noted there was no statement on the calculations that the engineer thought they were adequate.

Mr. Pidgeon said they use a safe process and had used it in Pioneer Square and the framework method had been approved elsewhere. Asked if the Brasa name would be on the sign Mr. Pidgeon explained it isn't on there now but the City permitting department requested the name of the business be on the sign. He said that any sign that says “Brasa” that they would put up there would not be attached to the building but would be a Plexi-board that attaches to the frame.

Ms. Sodt noted the applicant wasn't ready to provide sign copy or attachment details for adding “Brasa”.

Mr. Pidgeon agreed and said they will add “Brasa” because the City has requested it but not at this point because they didn't provide the documentation to the Board. He said the City will still issue the permit.

Ms. Sodt will work with the applicant on the addition of “Brasa”.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board members commented that it was reasonable and straightforward but to make sure the occupants were okay with it.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes 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 are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features 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/MH/MT

9:0:0 Motion carried.

080509.22

Fauntleroy Community Church

9260 California Ave SW

Proposed office/narthex expansion and elevator penthouse

Ms. Chave introduced the application. She said material samples were provided for the glazing.

Bob Becker and Tanja Reiners Kroeger from Becker Architects presented the application. Mr. Becker showed context of the site and pointed out where the work will occur. He pointed out the patio with pervious surface on the east side, a rockery and described the ground floor expansion and the addition of the elevator shaft. The new elevator will have five stops and the new entrance coming into the building will be ADA accessible. Using photos he explained where the elevator would come through the roof and noted the elevator penthouse would not be visible.

Ms. Kroeger noted the building is exposed mostly on the north end where no work is proposed.

Mr. Becker and Ms. Kroeger pointed out on the drawing where the work will occur and stated that neither the elevator overrun nor would the new doorway would be visible from the street. They said multiple levels of visibility were explored and the angle of the site will never allow them to be visible. The overrun will be made as small and low as possible and will be painted out to match the building. The glazing in front of the building had rotted and was replaced in Phase I and is the same window system and color scheme that will be used in this phase.

Ms. Kroeger went over demolition and new proposed construction plans showing elevations. Because of the slope of the site, the building "terraces" and at the basement level, she said the elevator will not be visible. Windows in the boiler room will be closed because the building will extend out over the top. She said on the back side they will remove the existing window wall and

will add a new window wall with a doorway that exits on-grade out to the new pervious patio. She noted new glazing on the existing building will be the same as what is used on the window wall replacement. She noted they discussed with ARC the existing dormer on the building and that they decided to retain it although they will take the floor out of the dormer space to create a light well to the space below. She said they are looking at two options (see plans) for the elevator overrun. She said one option is to site the elevator penthouse where it comes through overrun to sit behind single dormer. She noted they did sight lines to determine if they needed to bring the parapet all the way up and the sight lines indicate they don't. She said they would like to have the relief hood come up and be painted the same color of the building. She said their preferred option is the single width option (sheet A.2.3) for the elevator penthouse, which is the least imposing one.

Mr. Becker went over the new office area and said they will mimic the glazing that was used in the sanctuary although the lower portion (up to 3' level) will be frosted.

Material and color samples were reviewed.

Board Questions:

Mr. Lee noted the new window wall is at the back of the building facing the woods and will not be visible.

Mr. Veith asked for clarification about a colored object on elevation 4 and Mr. Becker explained that in the plan view it is a hidden elevation.

Ms. Tremaine asked if after the new sight lines were drawn it shows that the dormer would be less visible.

Ms. Kroeger said the height of the parapet would be reduced if it were okay to not have the top of the parapet around the relief valve. She said what is shown in the photograph would be slightly lower if it was okay to do that and paint out the relief hood.

Mr. Savage asked if it could be vented horizontally out back.

Ms. Kroeger said their preferred proposal won't be visible but could take that under advisement.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee said that in either option the vent will not be visible. He suggested the vent be painted dark gray.

Mr. Veith agreed that painting the vent something dark is preferable.

Mr. Savage preferred the smaller penthouse (option ion sheet A.2.3).

Mr. Veith also preferred the smaller penthouse. He noted that although it is awkwardly placed the bigger one would be more awkward.

Mr. Lee noted it will be a benefit to the building and is providing accessibility. He said it is removable and other options were explored by the applicant.

Mr. Veith suggested the smaller option (sheet A.2.3), no parapets, vented out back, and with the vent painted dark gray.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed office/narthex expansion, elevator penthouse, new door on the west elevation, and associated landscaping, as per the submittal with the additional direction that the smaller elevator penthouse option shown on Sheet A.2.3 shall be employed, and that the roof top vent shall be painted dark grey. The applicant may apply to Staff for approval of a vent option where the vent opens at the sidewall in the back of the penthouse. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 110348 as the proposed alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/TV/CH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

080509.3 DESIGNATION

080509.31 (former) Sixth Church of Christ, Scientist
2656 42nd Ave. SW

Jennifer Thompson, along with owner Dahli Bennett, gave the designation presentation (full nomination report in DON file) and began with providing context of the site. Ms. Thompson noted the increased vegetation surrounding the building today compared with when it was first built. She explained the

exterior is original fabric with the exception of the windows. She provided interior photos and noted there had been some renovations.

Dahli Bennett, owner, went over the interior renovations and noted the sloping entry way had been altered with steps, handrails, and a planting structure. She said the interior of the foyer was original. In the main hall the floor changes included: sloping floor was divided into three levels. On the first level a kitchen was added; on top of that they added a mezzanine that has a master suite; they added new railings, new floors with radiant heat and new light fixtures. Changes at the basement level included dividing the large room into two smaller rooms.

Ms. Thompson said the church was built in 1929 by architect Gerald C. Field whose work includes Cornish and the Jolly Roger but she stated this was his best work. She provided an overview of Field's career which began with employment by A. H. Albertson and then he went into practice by himself. She went on to say the building meets Criteria D, E, and F.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith added that Neil McDonald was the builder, and the building was designed by Gerald Field. He asked if the apparent beams in the main sanctuary were false beams.

Ms. Bennett and Ms. Thompson said that they did not know if the beams were false beams.

In response to Board questions Ms. Bennett said the dividers on the original fixed windows in the main hall are lead. She reported there is no record of the railing at the entry having been changed and noted that Larry Kreisman, Historic Seattle, thought it was original.

Mr. Veith noted the nomination included a reference to an art group that Field was a founding member of in 1905, but he didn't get here until 1908.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Conti supported designation and agreed with the Staff Report on Criteria D, E, and F.

Ms. Howard supported designation based on Criteria D, E, and F.

Mr. Hannum supported designation based on Criteria D, E, and F and commended the owner for being a great steward of the building.

Ms. Strong supported designation based on Criteria D, E, and F and appreciated the sensitivity of how the materials were re-used in the renovation.

Mr. Savage said it is a unique little gem in a diverse neighborhood and supported designation based on Criteria D, E, and F.

Ms. Tremaine supported designation based on D, E, and F and said this is the third Christian Science Church that has been designated and said the other two were much different and were much more compelling as far as designation goes because of their design. She said this one is quite plain, but she noted it was an excellent example of a rehabilitation to a new use.

Mr. Veith supported designation based on Criteria D and E but not so much F because it recedes because of the landscaping. But he added that he thought the landscaping improves it beyond its gem box appearance. He said Staff suggests the designation include the exterior of the building and the interior of the first floor foyer. He said he thought the stage/speaker's platform are in original condition, the wall is a distinctive feature of this type building and he thought they should be included.

Ms. Wirsching supported designation based on D, E, and F and questioned designating the site because there has been so much change.

Mr. Lee stated that designating the site offers more control and protection in the event of any future development. He supported designation based on Criteria D, E, and F. He said it is a quiet architectural statement and he noted the great renovation. He said it was great to see a historical structure re-used in a tasteful way and added he thought it was an amazing gem of a building.

Ms. Chave stated that in Controls and Incentives agreement they can address those site features that are not original.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the (former) Sixth Church of Christ, Scientist, at 2656 42nd Ave. SW a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include:

The site, the exterior of the building, and the interior of the first floor foyer of the building, including the ramps.

MM/SC/MS/MT

9:0:0 Motion carried.

080509.32 Maritime Building
911 Western Ave.

Ms. Sodt explained this was a Category 1 property in the Downtown Survey. She introduced Karin Link who would present the nomination on the City's behalf and noted Ms. Link's presentation would be followed by one by the owner. In addition to the Staff Report the owner's representative asked her to hand out suggested language for disapproval of designation.

Karin Link, Architectural Historian, presented the Nomination Report (available in DON file) and stated the original building permit was issued November 5, 1909 and expired on July 5, 1910. She noted that Stone and Webster are shown as builders on the title block which date from 1909. She said the drawings by Houghton or Houghton and Stone and Webster or Stone and Webster alone date anywhere from September to December 1909. She cited Tax Assessor and other county records which give dates in 1910. She said the building was under construction – the walls were standing - and was completed in 1910 or at the latest in 1911. She said it was an important building with strong connections to the waterfront: City Dock, and the West Seattle Ferry and Colman Dock, which were major showpiece docks. She noted the district is referred to as the Commission District in multiple publications.

She provided an historical overview of the Waterfront: the arrival of the Northern Pacific Railroad (provided a photo of the area in 1911); the Bogue Plan and harbor development. She said the Harbor Island plan was abandoned in 1913. She explained that Seattle was a thriving port by 1918 and was one of two major ports in the country. By 1911 it had not been supplanted by private development at Harbor Island or at Smith Cove. She said that the Maritime Building was part of a gateway from the waterfront up Madison Street.

She noted other buildings in the area: the Polson Building which is half the size of the Maritime Building, the 611 Western, John Egan Warehouse, and Schwabacher Warehouse among others. She went on to explain that the building housed a wide array of businesses: grocery wholesalers, light industry, shipping and transfer companies. She cited local architectural historian Mimi Sheridan who said the building was a significant contributor to the commerce of the neighborhood.

She said the building meets Criterion C; the building is associated with the major economic and physical development of the Waterfront and the wholesale warehouse district that was tied to it. She said the physical development of the area was particularly important between the 1900s and early teens; this is one of the substantial buildings developed there at the time.

She said the architect, E. W. Houghton, also was responsible for the Bailey Block, the Terry Denny Building and the Olympic Block. He formed a partnership with Charles Saunders and they produced some well-known buildings including the Bailey Block, Broderick Building and the Terry Denny Building amongst others. She said that the firm of Saunders Houghton dissolved in 1891 and Houghton then became known as a theater and warehouse designer. His buildings include the Moore Theater, the Lippy Building and the Cascade Laundry. Many of his buildings have been demolished or significantly altered.

Ms. Link said the Maritime Building was originally planned as a 6-story building. She described the division of elevations into 3 vertical sections. It has a relatively high ground floor, topped by a projecting cornice in concrete. The middle section consists of three floors, also topped by a similar cornice. The fifth floor is topped by a more imposing cornice. She noted the similarity of the base, shaft, capital of the Chicago School. She noted the varied and repeated rhythm of bays and window patterns create a striking exterior which given the size of the building could have been monotonous. She said the two most intact buildings by Houghton are the Moore Theater and the Maritime Building and she said the building is an outstanding work by a major Seattle architect and meets Criterion E.

Board Questions:

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Link said that the drawings date to 1909.

Mr. Veith asked if the Polson and 611 Western buildings in the Pioneer Square district would qualify for Landmark status. He asked how she would place the building and if being associated with the Commission District was the only trend that this building represents. He asked if it was a forward looking building.

Ms. Link stated that because they are in the district they are contributing and they are on the National Register. She went on to explain that the Maritime Building takes up a whole city block and served many tenants. She said it also serves as the gateway along Madison which was the defining northern edge and an important thoroughfare. She said the National Building is the oldest building still there and the Maritime is its utilitarian counterpart. She noted that the simpler buildings are taken for granted. She noted the consistent rhythm of the windows in the massive building. She noted the importance of the railroad which ran directly behind the building. In response to Board questions she explained that she regarded this as the biggest of the warehouse buildings in the area at that time and said the size in the area was not common. She said that other warehouse buildings were much smaller with the exception of American Can Company building which came much later.

Ms. Conti asked about the architectural style and if there were a number of other utilitarian warehouse buildings like this one in the area.

Ms. Link responded that she thought the building was a pared down Chicago School style. She said that the only similar building in the area is the National Building which is not as utilitarian and went on to say there weren't many similar buildings.

Ms. Wirsching asked why the Maritime Building would be considered significant and the Polson would not.

Ms. Link noted the repeated double hung windows and rhythm of fenestration. She said the Polson is only a half block and didn't have the design challenges of dealing with the massiveness.

Amy Kosterlitz, representing the owner, said the owners do not support designation because of obsolete systems and the plans for the viaduct. She introduced Don Brubeck, Bassetti Architects.

Mr. Brubeck presented his report (his full report is on file in DON) went through the Ordinance and Criteria and noted the building is not cited in the Pioneer Square Boundary extensions, the First Avenue District, Central Waterfront planning studies or previous downtown surveys. He said there is not a lot of interest in the building by the preservation community and that plans for an historic district did not include the building. He said the Maritime Building is seen as a backdrop building in all the plans for the removal of the viaduct and plans for waterfront development.

He said the architectural features that give this building its character are its concrete frame, windows, storefronts and on the inside timber frame and the wide open warehouse bays necessary for its original function. He went over integrity issues and said 2/3 of the windows had been replaced, storefronts had been replaced and the tile at the entries is not original. He said the corridor construction is recent and the ones that are there now were built in 1985.

He said the building was not associated with an important event or person. He said the use of the term "Commission District" was for predecessor buildings. He said the building was completed in 1911 and that financing had been obtained in 1911. He said the building had nothing to do with the commission sales merchants on the waterfront. He said "Commission District" was not a commonly used term and that sale of agricultural produces was coming to an end. He said that Pike Place Market became a public market in 1907 and said the Maritime building came as commission sales were ebbing.

Mr. Brubeck provided a map of the Seattle Harbor by the Port which illustrated that Harbor Island was built. He said it was built by a private contractor starting in 1905 and was in use by 1911. He said and that action and economic development was moving away from the Central Waterfront. He showed the tenants of the predecessor buildings versus those of the Maritime. He said other buildings were more commission sales and the Maritime was mostly light industrial with some shipping and transfer and some commission. He said the Maritime Building was not predominantly involved with the Commission District. He noted the transition from rail to motor vehicles. He said by the 1920s the industrial enterprises were moving away from the Central Waterfront which was becoming a business district. He said the building was not significant in the development of Produce Row, Commission Sales or in the development of any aspect of maritime, rail or motor freight.

Mr. Brubeck said the building does not meet Criterion D because it is not unique nor is it an especially good representative of a style. Mr. Brubeck said the Maritime was neither at the leading edge nor significant as a construction type. He showed photos of other warehouses and pointed out it was a refined building type before the Maritime. He said he did not think it was Chicago Style which was defined by large plate glass windows, often with bay windows and with limited, restrained ornamentation.

He said the building does not meet Criterion E and provided examples of other work by Houghton – the Moore Theater, Bailey Building, Terry Denny, and Lippy among others – that were more outstanding. He said it is not an outstanding work of Stone and Webster. He said the building did not meet Criteria C, D, E or F.

Ms. Kosterlitz said the building does not rise to the level of significance for Landmark status.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if, when constructed, it was the biggest building of its type.

Mr. Brubeck said he didn't know but said there were some longer ones and noted the Cannery.

Mr. Veith asked if it was significant that a number of tenants were shipping and warehouse operations and asked how they were operating.

Mr. Brubeck said they had both office and storage space in the Maritime. He said the first floor was made up of small offices, with access points at the middle, while the Western Avenue side had sales offices. The Railroad Avenue side had docks. He said both sides have stairwells and there are a

series of stairwell; the stairwells are what give the building its breakup or rhythm – wherever there is a stairwell there is a smaller bank of windows. He said he didn't have any idea when the commission came to Houghton to design the building but that an earlier design didn't come to fruition.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, spoke in support of designation. She said the building is associated with the development of the Central Waterfront. She said it is typical for commercial areas to shift and that shift doesn't diminish the significance, but adds to the narrative. She said it is typical for commercial building to have had altered storefronts. She said that just because a building is not mentioned in publications doesn't mean it isn't significant.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said she wasn't hearing how the building was significant and questioned what was significant about it. She did not support designation.

Mr. Veith said the building was completed in 1911 and started in 1909; he said dating buildings spans from commissioning of the architect to occupancy. He saw this as a more transitional type design. He said he thought that Stone and Webster were involved only in preparing the pier foundation. He said the building does not have Chicago Style windows but thought it could be defined as a Commercial style or Chicago Commercial style. He said it is a large commercial building style with a base, shaft, and a top. He said it is not strictly defined and it falls into that general category of the Commercial Style. He said it is the largest building that remains between Pike and Pioneer Square. Whether or not it showed up in a publication is not a good argument for/against – each author has his or her own picture of the world.

Mr. Veith said the building has good integrity although the storefronts have been changed, bay systems and tile surrounds have been added. He noted the owners have been responsible in replacing the windows in-kind above the street level and even though a lot of them have been replaced, the character of the building has been maintained. With regard to significance Mr. Veith said it did not meet Criterion F as it is a member of a large group but is not unique and does not contrast with siting of nearby buildings. The one factor that might make F work is that it is a big building. He said it is a competent mid-career work for Houghton but is not outstanding. With regard to C & D he said the building might have double significance if you could establish that the typology of building was a development that was specific to its place or set a standard for buildings that follow. He said the building does have a special relationship to the railroad on one side and the City on the other. He noted the difference in how the commission merchants worked before so this marks a

transition. When he looks at the neighbors – Polson and 611 Western – which are similar in placement, structure and even their physical expression he thought the building would be suitable as contributing or supporting structure in a district rather than one that stands on its own as a landmark.

Mr. Veith went on to say that it was hard to define a specific style although that is not a requirement. He said it was not innovative or an especially good example of the Chicago Commercial Style although it might fit into that category. He said it is a utilitarian building of board formed concrete, and is nicely articulated in an interesting consistent pattern. He said it could possibly meet Criterion C.

Ms. Tremaine did not support designation and said it blends into the landscape and is not a landmark in the neighborhood.

Mr. Savage said it is a fine example of historic waterfront and Pioneer Square area warehouse and storage building but it is not exemplary enough to be a landmark. He did not support designation but said it may have been better as part of a district.

Ms. Strong clarified that she had received the nomination report prior to the meeting at which the building was nominated; she had not received it at her office email but it was on her home computer. She said that while its sheer size was significant she did not support designation because it doesn't rise to the standards.

Mr. Hannum said that C and D were relevant and although he is fond of utilitarian buildings this one does not rise to the level to meet C or D.

Ms. Howard said that C and D were appropriate. She said with regard to C, the waterfront was significant and this building was connected to that but doesn't see that as enough and it did not meet C. She said the building did meet Criterion D and said it is a utilitarian building whose form does express its function well and she noted the rhythm of its fenestration and the way its façade is organized.

Ms. Conti said that while she appreciates utilitarian buildings she did not support designation.

Mr. Lee said the building is not significant and he would not support designation.

Action: I move that the Board not designate the Maritime Building at 911 Western Avenue a Seattle Landmark because it does not meet the standards for designation set forth in the Landmarks Preservation Ordinance SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/SS/MH

8:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Howard opposed.

080509.4 NOMINATIONS

080509.41 Harborview Medical Center—Center Wing of East Hospital
325 Ninth Avenue

Elise Chayet provided an overview of Harborview’s history and current operations and she explained the need to be fully operational as the Regional Trauma Center. She went over the planned seismic upgrade of the facilities and the demolition of areas that cannot be reinforced. She said Harborview supported the nomination of Harborview Medical Center but not that of Harborview Hall because of the inability to adaptively reuse it.

Mimi Sheridan, Architectural Historian, presented the nomination report (full report available in DON file) and began with providing context of the buildings and the site. She said that the King County Hospital was first located in Georgetown in 1877 and remained there for almost 40 years. Bonds were passed in 1928 and Harborview was opened in 1931.

Ms. Sheridan said architect Harlan Thomas, of Thomas Grainger Thomas, developed the Master Plan of which the Center Wing and Harborview Hall were part. She said the hospital was unique from others of its time; it was only for those who could not pay. It provides outpatient clinics, a psychiatric unit, and communicable disease wards and now it is notable for its trauma center. She said it was considered a state of the art facility that was well designed with advanced technology and noted the solariums on the tops floors. She went over photos showing the campus and buildings from different vantage points.

Ms. Sheridan provided an overview of the history of how the Center Wing developed and said that the establishment of the University’s School of Medicine in 1946 enhanced the hospital’s importance. In 1948 voters approved a bond issue to expand Harborview but it was 1951 before it was actually built. The hospital went downhill in the 1960s and University of Washington assumed management of the hospital which continues today – the County owns the property and UW manages it. She went over alterations made to the north wing and parking garage in 1966 and 1976; and the west hospital in 1987. She said the latest alteration was the seismic stabilization one in 2000 and noted that each phase impacted the Center Wing.

She went over photos noting building details. She explained that the fern fronds were removed from the top of the building after the 1948 earthquake. She pointed out the stepped up feature of the Art Deco style. She noted how

the tower stands out even with the west hospital building in front of it. She pointed out the sunray ornamentation on both sides and the ornamentation that goes up to the top. She said it is clad with yellow tile and a flame-like ornament at the top that is said to have been lighted at one time. She noted the Art Deco characteristics in the massing, setbacks, the strong vertical elements and the ornamentation at every level. She noted the sun and light theme at the top with the flame, the sun rays and at the bottom, the ferns. Inside this is continued in the caduceus which is an ancient symbol of medicine. She pointed out the ornate Art Deco ornamentation around the entry. The canopy was added in 1998. The Medic One facility was also added in 1998.

Ms. Sheridan explained that the marble entry is intact and noted the Art Deco theme and richness in materials comes through strongly. She noted the marble surrounds and the grillwork above the doors. She pointed out the grillwork on the windows and the bronze lamps. She said the vestibule which has decorative plaster work and is clad with marble. The only real change in the lobby is that in order to put in a handicapped ramp they took out the office space, put in a grill and then put the ramp in. They fabricated railings that are similar to the original rails. She noted the richness of the terracotta ornamentation and the coffered ceiling.

She noted that it was natural for hospitals to be sited on hills because it was a good place to get out of the noise and to get fresh air; people were encouraged to sit outside. She noted the massing and setbacks enable the hospital to be seen from afar.

Ms. Sheridan said that Harlan Thomas had travelled to Europe and noted that his works are mostly elegant and eclectic and romantic as evidenced in the Sorrento Hotel and the Chelsea Apartments. She noted that Harborview Hospital is where he where he was moving toward Modernism and this was his last major work. After this period he worked at the University of Washington's Department of Architecture. She reiterated this was his last major work and is the crown of his career.

John Savo, NBBJ, spoke in support of nomination of the Center Wing based on C, D, E and F. He said the hospital is the only Level 1 Trauma Center in the region and serves Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Alaska. The hospital provides services to the widest range of people – poor. He said it is a good example of Art Deco – Art Moderne style and went over details such as strong vertical emphasis, rich ornamentation. He noted Harlan Thomas's strong civic presence and this building compares well with his other work. He noted the prominence and its elevated position on the hill; other buildings are lower. He said it is an iconic Seattle building and he supported nomination.

Board Questions:

Ms. Howard asked who sculpted the ornamentation and Ms. Sheridan said she didn't know.

Mr. Veith said when viewed from the south and north it is very slender and wondered if there was a strong programmatic issue that caused that.

Ms. Sheridan speculated it was in the Master Plan which did envision a large U-shaped complex. She said it had to be a specific width to be practical to be a hospital in order to get light and air in. In response to other Board member questions she said the Georgetown facility was torn down in the 1960s.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, supported nomination of Harborview Hall and Harborview Medical Center (Center Wing) and said both were eligible under criteria C, D, and E. She said she consulted with Larry Kreisman and noted that both buildings are excellent. Although Harborview Hall was subordinate it was designed to complement the original building.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Conti agreed with the Staff Report and supported nomination based on C, D, E, and F; she said the building meets all the criteria. She said the building is beautiful and it would be a shame not to landmark it.

Ms. Howard supported nomination and wondered why it wasn't already a landmark. She agreed with the Staff Report.

Mr. Howard agreed with the Staff Report and said it is a great building.

Ms. Strong agreed with the Staff Report and supported nomination based on C, D, E, and F.

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

Ms. Tremaine agreed with the Staff Report and supported nomination based on C, D, E, and F.

Mr. Veith supported the nomination and said he would have supported based on F alone. He supported the nomination based on C, D, E and F and noted that E was the weakest.

Ms. Wirsching supported nomination based on the C, D, E, and F and said it is a wonderful building.

Mr. Lee agreed with the Staff Report and supported nomination based on C, D, E, and F. He said it is obviously a landmark.

Action: I move approval of the Harborview Medical Center, Center Wing of the East Hospital, 325 Ninth Avenue 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 and the interior of the Ninth Avenue lobby; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for September 16, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

Mr. Veith asked about amending the motion to include the site.

In response to a question about including the site Ms. Sodt explained the parcel was non-contiguous so it would have to be narrowed down and discussion ensued. Ms. Sheridan explained that as best as she could determine she gave the actual legal description of where the Center Wing is not including the other wings and clarified that the building and the site are the same thing. It was noted by Ms. Chave that this is different from The Kenny where the site was excluded and that this is a much more confusing site.

Mr. Veith said for most of the complex the site is not very controllable but there is space from the front of the building to street where the canopy is and between the wings.

Tom Walsh noted there was information and drawings in the packet they provided but said he would work with Staff and come back at Designation with the recommendation. He suggested using the definition provided which he thought would provide sufficient controls until the Designation meeting.

Action to amend above motion: I move to amend the motion to add the words “site of the Center Wing”. Mr. Hannum accepted the amendment.

MM/SC/TV/MS	9:0:0	Motion on amendment carried.
MM/SC/MH/CH	9:0:0	Motion carried.

080509.42 Harborview Hall
326 Ninth Avenue

Ms. Sheridan presented the nomination report (report available in DON file) and provided context of the site and an historical overview of the building. Harborview Hall was built as a home nurses attending the nursing school – it was not appropriate for young girls to live alone. There was a living room; the northern part of the first floor had lecture and class rooms, a library and also sample wards in which to practice. The UW School of Nursing started

offering classes in 1918 and the school was established in 1922. Earlier they probably worked in cooperation with programs at Swedish Hospital. Harborview Medical Center and Harborview Hall were opened 1931. In 1959 UW opened its hospital and the headquarters of the program moved over there and the last nursing program class was held here in 1961. In 1962 conversion to offices began and in 1963 the tower and elevator shaft were added. In 1972 a mental health clinic was built in the north parking lot area which was connected to Harborview Hall. In 1985 the north end of the first floor became mental health courtroom and in 2006 a second courtroom was added in the library.

She said the building has a simpler top and is smaller than the hospital. She pointed out the ornamentation on the first floor and the rich ornamentation at the entry and around the lobby: marble entry with grille work, bronze lamps, and fern frond ornamentation. She pointed out the original steel windows. She said the lobby is smaller than the hospital lobby and noted the wood paneling, clock and French doors. She said the library – which is now a courtroom – has original oak shelving. She pointed out the art deco detailing noting the light fixtures in the lobby, the rose motif paneling, rose tile flooring, deco detailing in the auditorium, and fireplace in the living room. She said the third floor still has the original configuration of sleeping rooms. She pointed out the tea room in the center of the floor.

John Savo, NBBJ, stated that Harborview Hall did not satisfy the landmark criteria. He noted the qualitative and hierarchical difference between Harborview Hall and the Center Wing building. He said they served different functions with Harborview Hall in a supporting roll. He said it is smaller and more simplified than the Center Wing and with its placement behind the Center Wing and mid-block siting it recedes. He pointed out that it is spare in detail and ornamentation.

Mr. Savo said the dorms for nurses were temporary housing and there was no public connection/interaction with it and that later uses didn't change that. He noted the lower floor to floor height. He pointed out the style is compatible with the Center Wing but is an abbreviated version. He said while there are some characteristics of Art Deco it is relatively simple and lacking in rich ornamentation. He said it is not an outstanding work of the designer – the Sorrento and the 7th Church of Christ Scientist are but Harborview Hall is not. He said Harborview Hall is not prominent, is sited mid-block and is not visible unless you are right in front.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wirsching asked if there was any other housing for nurses prior to this.

Ms. Sheridan replied that Swedish did and that there is one remaining – a two-story building on Queen Anne.

Ms. Wirsching asked about the condition of the front door and Mr. Savo responded that it was deteriorated.

Ms. Strong asked about the seismic stabilization and Ms. Sheridan said it was funded by a bond that had been put to vote.

Asked if Harborview Hall was included in that plan Ms. Chayet said they included in the assessment that the building could not be brought up to standard.

Public Comment:

Jim Erickson, First Hill Improvement, said Harborview Hall is in the center of the campus and is barely visible. He said that aesthetically he is barely aware it is there.

Larry Grouse, St. James Cathedral Administrator, said he is supportive of the plan to stabilize the buildings and to demolish this building. He did not support designation and said the building doesn't have a significant place in the local community and that it isn't easily identifiable and is dwarfed by the Center Wing. He said it is recessed which makes it disappear.

Leanne Prielip, Board of Trustees, explained the importance of meeting the needs as a Level 1 Trauma Center. She said the structure is unsound and is a risk to Harborview. She said demolition will allow them to continue their work and asked the Board not to nominate.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said it is a challenging nomination and noted the building does not appear outstanding nor is it distinctive or significant. She wanted to hear what the rest of the Board had to say.

Mr. Veith agreed that Criterion C sticks out because it is an institutional housing type that is disappearing. He said he would support nomination to allow further consideration.

Ms. Tremaine supported nomination based on Criterion C and its relationship to the nursing school. She requested a tour of the whole campus.

Mr. Savage did not support criteria D and E, but supported C because the dormitory aspect had merit.

Ms. Strong said part of what is appealing about Harborview Hall is that it is one of the original buildings in the Master Plan and its relationship to the Center Hall. She said it has been diminished because of the ongoing development of the campus. She said no to D and E but supported nomination based on Criterion C because it speaks to a way of life for single young women when the hall was built and this shifted in the 1960s. She said her support was tentative so it could be examined further.

Mr. Hannum supported nomination based on criteria C and D and said it is an ensemble piece and thought it interesting that it is subservient to the hospital across the way.

Ms. Howard supported nomination based on criteria C and D.

Ms. Conti did not support nomination and said it lacked significance of landmark status especially when compared to the Central Wing.

Mr. Lee did not support nomination because individually it did not have special quality and there are other more interesting buildings. He noted the interesting relationship to the other building but that it wasn't enough.

Action: I move approval of the Harborview Hall at 326 Ninth 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 site of Harborview Hall, the exterior of the building, and the interior of the Ninth Avenue lobby, that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for September 16, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/TV/CH

7:2:0 Motion carried. Mr. Lee and Ms. Conti opposed.

080509.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

080509.51 Volunteer Park Conservatory 1400 E. Galer

Ms. Chave went over the signed Controls and Incentives Agreement and said it is similar to the Montlake agreement. She said that she, Kathleen Conner and Parks had been working on a template for parks, community centers and public buildings. She said this one had more technical items relating to conservatory needs.

Action: I move to approve the Controls and Incentives Agreement for the Volunteer Park Conservatory as presented.

MM/SC/TV/CH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Savage left at 8:10 p.m.

080509.52 Terry Avenue Building
320 Terry Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a three month extension.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Terry Avenue Building for a period of three months.

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

080509.53 Sorrento Hotel
900 Madison St.

Ms. Chave said that there was a 30 day request for an extension.

Action: I move the Board approve a 30 day extension for consideration of the Controls and incentives.

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

080509.6 BOARD BUSINESS

080509.7 STAFF REPORT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator