



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 126/09

### MINUTES

#### Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, February 18, 2009 – 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Stephen Lee

Tom Veith

Mollie Tremaine

Meredith Wirsching

Christine Howard

Mark Hannum

Mollie Tremaine

Sean Peterfreund

Steve Savage

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Sarah Sodt

Melinda Bloom

#### Absent:

Vernon Abelsen

Marie Strong

Alyce Conti

#### **021809.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meeting of January 7, 2009

MM/SC/MH/CH

5:3:0 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Lee, Mr. Savage and Ms. Wirsching recused themselves.

#### **021809.2 NOMINATIONS**

##### 021809.21 William Tell Hotel

2327 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained that the William Tell Hotel is a Category 1 building in the Downtown survey and introduced Mimi Sheridan, who would present the nomination report (report on file) for the City.

Mimi Sheridan provided context of the site and scale of area buildings. She explained the building was a hotel located in the “film row” block of film industry buildings. It was built in 1924-26 as the “Hotel Lorraine” by Lister Holmes and the name was changed to “William Tell” in 1940. It was owned by Colin Radforth who also developed the Gainsborough and Marlborough apartments on First Hill. The William Tell Hotel fell into disrepair and was restored in 1986 and operated as low income housing. Not much has changed on the exterior. Ms. Sheridan touted the terracotta as the finest in the City; it was well developed with a lot of different decorative pieces. The entry has its original doors and windows. She described the capitals with the sea creatures and the twisted ornamentation, the arched windows above the entry and acanthus leaves. Beside the entry way there are original windows with two different patterns of shield designs. Above the entry way are arched windows and balcony with acanthus leaf corbels. The building is T-shaped with a light well on each side. The roof is metal now but was originally tile. The windows on the rear and side were replaced with metal 1/1 which she thought was reasonable since they are only visible from the alley; the rear fire escape was rebuilt and the interior was minimally updated. She said there were apartments in the front where it is wider with studios and SROs in the back.

Architect J. Lister Holmes was a premier Modernist who graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1913. She explained that he had two or three distinct periods of his work. He had a strong eclectic period during the 1920s. He worked with Bebb and Gould in 1920, went solo in 1922 – this is one of the early buildings he did on his own. He worked for Seattle Housing Authority from 1940-43 where he worked Rainier Vista and Yesler Terrace. After the war he became a renowned Modernist. He is best known for the Catherine Blaine School, Seafirst Bank, Rainier Vista, Yesler Terrace, Sovereign Apartments and the Costa Vista.

#### Board Questions:

In response to clarifying questions Ms. Sheridan explained she wasn't sure when the stucco details were added. She categorized the building as Spanish Revival by the twisted patterns and the original tile roof. She said the building was first a hotel – not a luxury hotel but not a flophouse either – and later it became an SRO. She believes the building qualified based on designation standards D and E, that the terracotta is outstanding and the best in the City and she said the William Tell Hotel is an outstanding work of J. Lister Holmes' eclectic work from early in his career.

Ms. Sodt explained that the lobby has been altered, and it originally featured standard interior finishes.

Kurt Fisher and Jerry Piggoti, owners, stated they plan to take the hotel back to its origins. It was a workman hotel with a special façade; they plan to make it an upscale youth hostel.

Mr. Piggoti said they are in the SEPA process and they face challenges with the City in that code does not allow it to be entirely operated as a hostel use.

Mr. Lee explained that if the building is designated then there may be the opportunity to negotiate some of those challenges.

Mr. Fisher expressed interest in the “film row” history of the block and thought the neighborhood, with its restaurants, bars and cabarets, is reminiscent of what went on in the 1920s. The owners want to preserve the façade and also take it back to its original use.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, said the building is similar to Brasa in that it epitomizes the neighborhood. She thought it met designated F and thought this was a significant work of J. Lister Holmes. She supported nomination.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith was impressed with the quality of the terracotta and the ingenuity of design – especially in the capitals and the character of the front. When designed it is unlikely the tile on the sides was a feature of the building but in view of the fact that in his later work Lister Holmes became a Modernist the tile wall seems more interesting. He supported nomination based on criteria D and perhaps C because of its association with the buildings in the immediate vicinity. He stated he was less enthusiastic about E because it was not outstanding in Holmes’ portfolio. He was curious why the building was named the William Tell and wondered if it was because the William Tell Overture was used for the Lone Ranger movies.

Mr. Peterfreund supported nomination based on criteria C and D; he wasn’t sure about E.

Ms. Tremaine supported nomination based on criteria C, D, and E and noted it was a charming building. She appreciated hearing the owners’ appreciation of the culture of the building.

Ms. Howard thanked the owners for their support of the nomination. She said the terracotta is outstanding and would like to hear more information about it. She supported the nomination based on the criteria identified in the Staff Report.

Mr. Hannum agreed and appreciated the owners’ desire to bring it back to what it was. He supported nomination based on C, D, and at this point, E.

Mr. Savage supported nomination based on Criterion D and said the architectural character is terrific.

Ms. Wirsching supported nomination based on criteria C, and D. She didn’t think it was an outstanding work of Holmes but an interesting part of his body of work.

Mr. Lee supported nomination based on C, D and E. He thought it was an outstanding work of Holmes. He said it was great that it was next door to the MGM and great to have enthusiastic owners.

Action: I move approval of the William Tell Hotel at 2327 Second 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; that the public meeting for Board consideration of

designation is scheduled for April 1, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MH/CH

8:00 Motion carried.

**021809.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

021809.31 Pacific McKay and Ford McKay  
601-615 Westlake Avenue North

*Mr. Peterfreund recused himself.*

**Applicant Comment:**

Victoria Bucher, Vulcan, introduced the history of the project and that they briefed the ARC on several occasions and have also briefed the full Landmarks Preservation Board, they have also presented to community groups, Historic Seattle and the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, summarized the project explaining the expansion of Mercer will take over the property on which these two landmarked buildings sit. Due to the fact that the Pacific McKay Building was constructed being partially supported on the foundation of the adjacent building and partially on pilings that seem to be failing the best approach to relocating the structures is to identify and remove the historic features, catalog them and then apply those pieces back onto the new equivalent sized frames as part of the new development. Features on the Ford McKay Building to be relocated were identified as the terracotta, and the wood frame windows on the first floor which would be reinstalled along with steel sash window that is similar in appearance to the original industrial steel sash windows and wood cross sash within the clerestory. Features on the Pacific McKay Building to be relocated were identified as the two facades with terracotta features, stained and leaded glass windows, granite slab base, all terracotta, card wood transom over door, wood and steel windows, and the interior showroom features including the windows, planter boxes at the mezzanine, door assemblies at the first floor, the stairway assembly and the terracotta fountain. Ms. Boyle explained that portions of the projecting cast plaster cornice, capitals, engaged columns and piers would be cast in plaster and replicated; the base would be salvaged. A portion of the terrazzo floor has been taken out to be analyzed so the matrix can be identified for replication. They are preparing the specifications and drawings for the demo work with all the salvage to occur before demolition.

David Yuan, NBBJ, provided the current context of the buildings and the impact upon them from the Mercer expansion. When relocated, the buildings will hold the same position/relationship to Mercer as they do now. Using a model he described how they planned to incorporate the buildings into the larger new development. The garage block will be utilized as a public plaza. They will create a screen wall out of steel I-beams and C-channels. The Showroom will be a café or restaurant use that could look out into the plaza area. The fountain will be visible from inside as well. They will bracket the ends of the existing building with the ends of the new building to allow visual distinctiveness of the historic buildings to be read separately from the

new building. There will be a glass curtain wall will make distinction between what is the backdrop to these buildings and what is the original portion.

Mr. Yuan stated that the Queen Anne Design Review Board would defer to the Landmarks Preservation Board's judgment with regard to the screen wall. He pointed out the original garage with its wide opening and thinner openings and showed how it was proposed to be used as a plaza space. To provide screening from the traffic on Mercer they propose a row of trees plus a screen wall to create a more secluded space that is anchored by the fountain. He said there was a desire to separate the screen wall from the other building by eliminating the header so there would be a free standing screen wall next to the office piece. He thought it made the screen wall look ungrounded and unconnected to the garage rhythm. The wide opening of the original garage is where the handicapped ramp is located that leads down to the courtyard.

Ms. Boyle stated that the way Mr. Yuan described it was like "appropriation" which is a really common approach in the arts today in using different pieces. She said if it doesn't connect to the older building it makes the screen wall an isolated sculptural element.

Board Questions:

Mr. Lee stated that ARC supported Mr. Yuan's approach.

Mr. Veith stated he was uncomfortable with the wider space at the one opening because it feels like a fourth element. If it were not connected the wider would be more acceptable but it was not a big enough concern to make him vote against the scheme. He thought the building model was attractive; he asked for clarification on the color selection of the glass curtain wall on the model versus that on the rendering.

Mr. Yuan said it was not as close as on the model. It was not real homogenous; the glass will appear darker during the day. By the time the building is constructed and the mullions are added and the interior lighting is there, the light glass will actually appear darker.

Mr. Lee agreed that the darker background would be preferable to the light.

Ms. Wirsching appreciated the contrast between new and historic and asked about the rationale behind the height of the screen wall.

Mr. Yuan explained the height came back to actual location of the top of an element on the garage that he pointed out on the drawing. The top of that element is where they kept the top of the office portion.

Ms. Tremaine noted the header was necessary because it ties it all together. She thought darker glass on the curtain wall would be most effective.

Ms. Howard asked about the opening of the screen wall.

Mr. Yuan said the width of the opening allowed them to introduce the ADA ramp without having another break in the screen wall.

Mr. Veith asked what the design of the new storefront at the south end of the façade was based on.

Ms. Boyle showed an advertisement from 1925; originally the southern most bay was for tractors, then an entrance for vehicles, then it was changed to a storefront. They are appropriate locations for entry and are consistent with what was historic.

Mr. Veith explained that in general like a store front system it doesn't have to be rigidly like the original. He clarified that they are picking up a pattern found elsewhere on the façade and using it in that space – trying to maintain character of buildings.

Public Comment:

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, stated she enjoyed the progress and the dedication from the owner and ARC members to make the project come together. With what is happening on Mercer the history of the buildings will be there. She shared a story of a friend getting brochures for new cars and having her picture taken next to a new car there in the 1950s.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Howard said it was an elegant solution and while it is difficult to think of historic structures being disassembled, there is a compelling case for it to be done.

Ms. Wirsching agreed and said keeping the screen element associated with the building made sense.

Mr. Veith stated that the building has been well document and will be reassembled and is maintaining all it character; he thought requirements in the demolition section of the ordinance are being handled in an appropriate manner though not in strict accordance with the language, given that the building isn't disappearing forever.

Ms. Sodt stated it is an unusual situation given the long timeline. She and Karen Gordon have been working closely with the applicant to ensure that the code requirements for demolition are being met.

Mr. Lee said they are two great buildings; he recently looked at photos of the interior space and are worth it and he is sure the owner is interested in keeping the buildings as they are.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed alterations, with the conditions that the applicant continue to brief the Architectural Review Committee (in person or in writing) regarding the process of salvaging the historic features of the building, and that a covenant is recorded that provides a commitment to the City that any redevelopment of the property will not occur without incorporation of the historic features of the Pacific McKay Building and the Ford McKay Building.

This action is based on the following:

1. In regards to *SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significance change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Designation Report*: While the proposal includes demolition, the primary facades and the designated interior features will be salvaged and incorporated into a new development on the site, therefore the primary elevation and view of the building will not be adversely affected by the proposal. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of an historic feature, the new feature shall match the visual qualities of the old feature, as per Standard #6 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. In regards to *SMC 25.12.750 B, The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner*: The applicant explored and presented three alternatives for this project, which were presented during briefings to both to the Architectural Review Committee and the Landmarks Preservation Board; these alternatives are described within the applicant's submittal.
3. The other factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C and 25.12.750 D are not applicable at this time in the process.
4. The applicant will comply with the provisions of SMC 25.12.835.

MM/SC/MT/CH 7:0:0 Motion carried. Mr. Peterfreund recused himself.

**021809.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

021809.41 Eitel Building  
1501 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a sixty day extension.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Eitel Building a period of sixty days.

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

021809.42 Fischer Studio Building  
1519 Third Avenue  
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a ninety day extension. She said being a condo it is more complicated because there are many owners and the condo association meetings have been on the same night as the Board meeting.

Mr. Veith asked if Ms. Sodt were able to assuage the owners' concerns about the recommended controls.

Ms. Sodt said some of the owners aren't as concerned as others. They are meeting internally first.

Mr. Lee noted the benefits of the process for owners especially related to the energy code.

Ms. Sodt said there are just a few owners who are uncomfortable from a practical viewpoint and they are trying to come up with some items that they can put in the Controls Agreement that will make them feel more comfortable with the process – some administrative review items. She has been working closely with them.

Mr. Lee noted the work that is ongoing at the nearby Joshua Green Building.

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

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

021809.43 Fitch-Nutt House  
4401 Phinney Avenue N.

Action: I move to extend consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Fitch-Nutt House for a period of six months.

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

**021809.5 BOARD BUSINESS**

**021809.6 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator