



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 595/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, October 15, 2008 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Stephen Lee

Alyce Conti

Henry Matthews

Tom Veith

Vernon Abelsen

Marie Strong

Christine Howard

Mark Hannum

Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Sarah Sordt

Karen Gordon

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Jerry Finrow

Mollie Tremaine

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM.

101508.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of August 20, 2008

MM/SC/MH/MS

6:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Howard abstained.

Meeting of September 3, 2008

MM/SC/MH/MS

4:0:3 Minutes approved. Mr. Abelsen, Ms. Conti and Ms. Howard abstained.

101508.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

101508.21 Leona/Park Ridge Apartments

916 Queen Anne Ave N

Ms. Gordon presented the staff report. She explained the rehabilitation period was August 27, 2006 through 2008 and provided the submitted eligible rehabilitation costs.

Mr. Abelsen noted an error in the report under items disallowed costs prior to August 27, 2008 the date should be August 27, 2006.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Parkridge on Queen Anne, 1 Ward Street, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/MS/CH 7:0:0 Motion approved.

Maria Barrientos advised that the correct address has changed to 1 Ward Street.

101508.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

101508.31 Coca Cola Building
1313 E. Columbia St

Ms. Chave explained the application for proposed exterior paint colors and provided samples for Board review.

Steven Yamada-Heidner, project architect, explained the paint chip is the representative color because the PhotoShop version is washed out. He said they did a scrape test to determine the floor which they found to be more tan and monochromatic. There will be some differentiation from field color to window color – the walls will have a satin velvet finish while the windows will be glossier.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked about the difference in tone on the field between the windows and the tone on the coping and on overhanging units.

Mr. Yamada-Heidner explained the PhotoShop process skewed the photos a bit.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee thought it was great to have found the original color and that the applicant is taking the building back to its original look.

Mr. Veith said this is generally preferable because we like to get back to original colors when possible. He said this shows off the detailing of the building for what it is rather than the garish display the addition of the blue created. He said it is entirely appropriate for the building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior paint color, 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 Designation Report as the proposed exterior paint color does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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/VA/TV

7:0:0 Motion approved.

101508.4 NOMINATIONS

101508.41 North Transfer Station
1350 N 34th Street

Henry Friedman, Seattle Public Utilities, introduced the nomination. He explained the City used dumps until the transfer stations were built. He said one was built in the north and one in the south; they were basically identical in design and structure. The buildings have been modified over time as needed to adapt to change in vehicles and to accommodate recycling. He introduced Beth Dodrill who would present her report (full report in file).

Mr. Matthews arrived at 3:50 p.m.

Beth Dodrill explained the historic context of both transfer stations; they were designed by Roy W. Morse, Seattle City Engineer and architects Durham, Anderson and Freed. Mr. Morse was involved in significant Public Works projects: roads, Civic, Seattle Center, watersheds, I-90, and I-5 development. She said the transfer stations were not significant contributions to his work. Durham, Anderson and Freed were more known as architects of churches and won many awards. The transfer stations were not published or mentioned anywhere.

Ms. Dodrill explained the history of waste management and the significance of the transfer station in the evolution of waste management in the United States. In the 1950s and 1960s the in-City landfills were reaching capacity; it was determined the transfer station was the best method to collect and then transfer refuse.

Ms. Dodrill explained the concrete structural system and said the precast technology of the 1960s was characterized by innovations in structural systems. The system was experimental in the transfer station and the technology was rapidly evolving. In the 1970s construction evolved to the use of concrete panels with steel components. There have been modifications: a compactor was added, doorways altered on the scale house, HVAC system replaced, the original operations building was replaced in 1994.

Ms. Dodrill provided the context of the site in Wallingford. The area developed due to access to water and rail as an industrial area with a later shift to light industrial, warehouse and manufacturing that took advantage of proximity to Aurora and I-5. The transfer station was constructed in 1967 when the area had shifted to light industrial use; today the use in the area is shifting to biotechnology along the waterfront.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith stated that the site was one of the first parts of Wallingford to be settled. He said the Ashworth property was at least partially where the transfer station was built. He said that after he developed property, parts were passed to the City. He said there was controversy when the building was put up because there was an historic structure – the stables – on the site. He asked Ms. Dodrill if she had found any association of that nature that should be considered.

Ms. Dodrill stated she came across it in only one reference in an engineering journal but found nothing in newspaper articles. It is probably a forgotten part of Wallingford history.

Mr. Veith went on to say the Wallingford Community Council was first organized to resist placement of this building. It resulted in a lot of the earliest public improvement activities in the community; he wondered if that showed up in any of her research.

Ms. Dodrill stated she came across an article although it didn't link it directly to the transfer station; it was an article about development along the waterfront. The article had to do with heights and setbacks and didn't mention the transfer station specifically. She noted she came across a letter from a community member who proposed putting tennis courts on top of the building; it was looked at but deemed not feasible.

Mr. Abelsen asked the applicant to elaborate on the advances in the technology used in the design of the building structure itself and the influences the new way of waste handling influenced the equipment the technology of the transport of getting the waste out of the City and the overall technology of the whole system.

Mr. Friedman explained it wasn't uncommon to transfer from smaller trucks to larger ones; the major advance with the design of the trucks was their built-in compactors which allows today's residential trucks to spend all day collecting and make only one trip back to the station. It allowed for more efficient movement of waste material.

Ms. Dodrill noted it was significant in the process of waste management in Seattle but there wasn't anything innovative in the way it was being done here compared to other areas of the country. There was a lot of shared information and much of the new design was built upon other design technology. The difference in design between King County facilities and the City is that the County facilities were more open; the one in Wallingford was more enclosed to try to fit into the more residential neighborhood. The North Station was well designed for its site; they tried to make it aesthetically pleasing yet put trees a round to hide it.

Ms. Dodrill explained the use of structural T-beams was much more common at that time to have a 120' span; here they achieved a span of 128'. Research didn't indicate this impacted any future design and was really an experiment with the techniques.

Mr. Veith wondered if consideration had been given to use a spur from the railroad to collect the garbage rather than transferring it to trucks.

Ms. Dodrill didn't find anything where the feasibility of rail and marine transport from that location was discussed. She thought the location was significant because they wanted something in the north part of the City. The Bitter Lake area and Carkeek Canyon were considered as a site as well.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith stated the building had an affect on the social character of the neighborhood although he doubted the neighborhood would lobby for the retention of the structure. He said the structure fit in to the area and took advantage of the character at the time. He said because of its generating power as an organizer of the community it has a strange importance which he is reluctance to just throw away. He said the building itself is not worth celebrating and he is leaning toward "no".

Mr. Hannum appreciated Mr. Veith's comments. The building doesn't meet the criteria; he did not support nomination.

Mr. Abelsen agreed with Mr. Veith but with a different point of view. He explained the building does embody distinctive visible characteristics of a method of construction and it contributes to the development of a body of knowledge for public works and waste management and that change altered urban planning in many ways. He thought it might be worthy and wanted to hear from the rest of the Board.

Ms. Strong did not support nomination.

Ms. Howard thought Messrs. Veith and Abelsen did a good job of encapsulating the history. She didn't think it rose to the level of significance to be a landmark.

Ms. Conti agreed and stated while the building was well designed for the site it does not rise to the level of significance.

Mr. Matthews thought the innovative technology really happened on the trucks. He said the concrete design was innovative but there are better examples of it. He did not support nomination.

Mr. Lee did not support nomination as the building does not rise to the level of significance. To say it was "aesthetically planned" is a stretch but he thought the "community under threat" aspect intriguing.

Mr. Veith the building is not an expressive piece of architecture and did not take advantage of any of the opportunities to organize space to make it interesting or to

make it display anything about itself; it is just a box with a newer post and beam. Even though he thought the building important it doesn't display its importance

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the North Transfer Station at 1550 N. 34th St. as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the Staff Report.

MM/SC/HM/MH 8:0:0 Motion approved.

101508.42

South Transfer Station
8100 2nd Ave. S.

Mr. Friedman explained the South Transfer Station was similar to the one in Wallingford with slight differences.

Ms. Dodrill explained it was built before the North Station which was patterned after it. She provided contextual information on the site in South Park which was originally developed as farming community. The channelization of the Duwamish was significant. Early industry originated in Georgetown on the east side of the river; as the river was channelized and with the advent of WWII, the area started to shift to more industrial. The site was an historic dump and later when SR 509 was built and 99 was extended the area developed as more industrial because of the great transportation connections. The site and traffic circulation was reconfigured in 1989 because of the addition of an exit off Hwy 99; the original entry at the north end was moved to the southeast corner. At the same time the Scale House was relocated and altered. A compactor was added which greatly impacted the building's integrity. The original Operations Building has been altered: new sliding door installed, exterior panels have been changed, and a modular trailer unit was added to the rear. The buildings were designed by Durham, Anderson and Freed but the garage was designed by the City of Seattle Engineering Department. She provided photos of various views of the buildings, site and neighborhood context.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith noted the building was built on what began as a landfill and wondered if the topography was altered at both transfer stations.

Ms. Dodrill said the Wallingford station is not on a former landfill but a lot of grading was done to accommodate the structure. More engineering was done at the South Station to the substructure because the soil was not stable. There were more retaining walls, engineering testing of soils making it a more challenging site.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews did not support nomination.

Ms. Conti agreed with Mr. Matthews and did not support nomination as the building did not rise to the level of significance.

Ms. Howard agreed with Ms. Conti.

Ms. Strong did not support nomination based on the Staff Report.

Mr. Abelsen agreed with Ms. Strong.

Mr. Hannum did not support nomination.

Mr. Veith could see the similarity and the unresponsiveness to the surroundings and they seem more ham fisted as a pair. He did not support nomination.

Mr. Lee agreed with Mr. Veith and stated the building did not rise to any level of significance.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the South Transfer Station at 8100 2nd Ave. S. as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the Staff Report.

MM/SC/MH/MS 8:0:0 Motion approved.

101508.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

101508.51 Pantages House 803 E. Denny Way

Ms. Chave explained the Pantages House Controls and Incentives had been approved; it was a standard agreement. She said a Certificate of Approval will be required for the exterior of the building and the site and excludes in kind maintenance and repairs and shrubs, perennials and annuals. It includes Administrative Review for mechanical equipment, fire escapes, etc..

Action: I move that the Board approve the Controls and Incentives Agreement for the Pantages House.

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

101508.52 Sorrento Hotel 900 Madison St.

Ms. Chave explained the owner requested an extension of one month.

Action: I move that the Board defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Sorrento Hotel for a period of one month.

MM/SC/TV/MH 8:0:0 Motion approved.

101508.6 BOARD BUSINESS

Christine Palmer, Historic Seattle announced a Landmarks Nomination Workshop that would include past Landmarks Board members and County Landmarks Board members. She said Peter Steinbrueck is scheduled to speak. She provided date, time

and place. She also noted they are working on gaining Continuing Education credits for Real Estate professionals to learn education and advocacy that Real Estate professionals should provide to buyers as part of due diligence.

101508.7 STAFF REPORT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator