



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 257/09

### MINUTES

#### Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

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

Room 4080

Wednesday, May 6, 2009 – 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Stephen Lee, Chair

Marie Strong

Tom Veith

Mollie Tremaine

Meredith Wirsching

Christine Howard

Alyce Conti

Sean Peterfreund

Mark Hannum

Steve Savage

Vernon Abelsen

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Genna Nashem

Karen Gordon

Rebecca Frestedt

Melinda Bloom

#### Absent:

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

#### **050609.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meeting of April 1, 2009

MM/SC/MH/MS

8:03 Minutes approved as amended. Ms. Conti, Ms. Howard and Mr. Lee abstained.

#### **050609.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

050609.21

Columbia City Live Aboves

3827A-3829D S. Edmunds St.

(Columbia City District)

Proposed revisions to building signage plan

**Summary of proposed changes:** Signage

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Rebecca Frestedt explained the proposed revision to the Live Aboves's building sign plan and the request for retroactive approval of a bollard sign. She distributed drawings and photographs. She said on April 17, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for signage.

Applicant Comment:

Philip Christofides, from Arellano Christofides, described the need for a taller sign on S. Edmonds and said with more retail business coming in there is a desire for better visibility from the corner of Rainier and S. Edmonds and a larger sign seemed appropriate. He asked that blade signs be allowed to be illuminated and noted that individual proposals would come back for Board approval. He said there was a desire by the community to increase life in the network of alleys. He also requested retroactive approval of the bollard sign which provides wayfinding for businesses in the back. Ms. Frestedt explained the bollard materials were consistent with the District Design Guidelines. She stated that bollard signs are not called out in the guidelines the Committee discussion included the need to revisit the Guidelines to add language for this type of signage. Mr. Abelsen, a member of the Columbia City Review Committee, noted the CCRC had agreed that the vertical orientation of the blade signs was appropriate and the bollard sign was unobtrusive and reversible.

In response to a clarifying question Mr. Christofides said the surrounding area is an extension of the Rainier commercial corridor and that the Review Committee was supportive of the application.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee noted the CCRC approval.

Mr. Hannum said the proposal is consistent with the District and the Guidelines.

**Action:** I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

**Relevant Code citations**

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

**Relevant guidelines**

**11. Signs.** All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications will be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape, texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color, and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District. The primary reference will be to the average

pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

**b. Blade Signs.** Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

**g. Sign lighting.** Sign lighting should be subdued and incandescent. Signs that flash, blink, vary in intensity, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion shall not be permitted.

**h. Neon Signs.** Neon may be permitted where judged appropriate on a case-by-case basis. Size, letter style, color, intensity and overall impact of the neon sign shall be evaluated for compatibility with the other signs and buildings in the District. If a plexiglass backing is proposed, it shall be clear and colorless. Neon signs should be designed to reflect the unique nature of the use within the building. Mass-produced neon signs are strongly discouraged.

The number of allowable neon signs shall be limited to one for each 10 linear feet of business frontage or portion thereof. Signs need not be spaced one per 10 feet, but may be clustered, provided the grouping does not obscure visibility into the business. Permitted neon signs may be located in transom windows.

**MM/SC/TV/VA**

**11:0:0 Motion carried.**

050609.22

Columbia City: various locations throughout the district  
(Columbia City District)

Proposed installation of pedestrian street light fixtures in thirteen (13) locations throughout the District.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the proposed “5th Avenue” style pedestrian lighting fixtures were selected to match the existing lighting installed along S. Edmunds St. Exhibits included photographs, site plans and specification sheets. She said the Landmarks Preservation Board approved the installation of up to 8 single-globe street light fixtures on June 11, 2004. She said that not all of the fixtures were installed following the Board’s approval. She said on April 17, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee reviewed the application for street use. The Committee did not make a formal recommendation to the Board.

Therese Casper provided an overview of the application and presented a map showing existing and proposed pedestrian globe lights and modern street lights. She

noted the different heights and function of each style of fixture. She said the single globe lamps are 14' high to be scaled at the pedestrian level to help activate the area. With regard to placement of the new lights, the location of existing trees and windows was taken into account.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum said the CCRC approved the overall concept in 2004 and said this application is consistent with the plans presented at that time.

Mr. Abelsen stated the exhibits provide clarity requested by CCRC and that the additional photos further help to show the location and proximity of proposed light fixtures to the curb.

Mr. Veith asked if the spacing was determined by the relationship to adjacent buildings and trees rather than creating a specific pattern of lighting fixtures.

Ms. Casper said the overall intent is to create a pattern with the lights but the placement was adjusted based on the location of trees, driveways, and doorways. She said this proposal completes the project. She said there is only one globe on S. Hudson because it was determined that only one is needed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said it seemed well thought out and adjustments were made to accommodate the needs of the community.

**Action:** I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Street Use. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

**Relevant Code citations**

**SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property**

**Relevant Design Guidelines**

**7. Street Use.** Any work that affects a street, alley, sidewalk, or other public right-of-way, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board. Emphasis shall be placed on creating and maintaining pedestrian-oriented public spaces and rights-of-way. Street trees and other plant materials that add human enjoyment to the District shall be encouraged. Decorative treatments within the sidewalk, including special paving patterns and building entryway tiling shall be preserved. The use of alleys for services and public-oriented activities shall be encouraged.

**8. Street Furniture.** All elements of street furniture, including but not limited to street lights, benches, trash receptacles, and planters, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board as to their specific compatibility with the District.

Street furniture must be appropriately sized and sited to afford generous provisions for pedestrian flow.

**MM/SC/MH/CH**

**11:0:0 Motion carried.**

**050609.3**

**DESIGNATION**

050609.31

George Washington Carmack House  
1522 E. Jefferson St.

Mimi Sheridan, Architectural Historian, presented the nomination (full report in file). She introduced Reverend Dennis Andersen, a former chair of the Landmarks Board whom she said is extremely knowledgeable about early Seattle residences, including plan book and kit houses and that he will address Criterion D. She began by discussing the two threshold criteria and said the first is that the building must have significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city, state or nation. She said the significance and value of the Carmack house are demonstrated by the fact that it meets three criteria. She said the building must also have sufficient integrity or the ability to convey its significance and that the house has both a very high degree of integrity and the ability to convey its significance.

Ms. Sheridan explained there is no requirement, nor even an expectation, that the building have the mark of the person with which it is associated. The usual guideline is that the building retains the essential physical features that it had during the period of its association with the person—basically that it has enough integrity that a person of that time period would be able to easily recognize it. George Carmack would certainly recognize this house as his home. She said a property important for illustrating a particular architectural style or period must retain most of the features that identify the style or period. This house clearly does so. She pointed out in the photos that the house is largely unchanged from its 1937 appearance. She explained that integrity is not the same as condition. While the house needs repairs, it retains a high degree of integrity. Carmack was one of Seattle’s earliest car owners, in 1902, and actually drove to San Francisco at that time. He built the garage about 1910 and it was one of earliest in the area.

She said with regard to Criterion B it is associated in a significant way with the life of a person important in the history of the City, state or nation. She noted she had spent considerable time reading accounts of the Klondike, including primary sources and other contemporary accounts. She said the Carmack papers, with letters and legal records, at the University of Washington give a more complete picture of his life, his family and his activities. She said George Carmack is generally acknowledged, both in the United States and in Canada, to have played a vital role in the gold rush, along with his two Tagish partners, “Skookum Jim” and “Dawson Charlie” and most sources credit all of them as a group effort.

Ms. Sheridan said even before the discovery, Carmack had several accomplishments during his ten years in the North and went on to explain that after arriving in May 1885, he worked as a packer and piloted the official Canadian survey (Ogilvie) party in 1886-87. She said in 1892 he established a trading post on the Yukon River, which he ran for about four years and during that time, he also owned and developed

the Tantalus coal mine nearby. She said this trading post grew into the Village of Carmacks, which currently has a population of about 500. She explained that prospectors had been finding small amounts, of gold in the Yukon for years, but it is very clear, from numerous accounts, that the discovery made by the Carmack group on August 17, 1896 triggered the stampede that transformed both the Yukon and Seattle. She said that Carmack filed claims for himself and his partners and the record shows that they worked the claims together for about four years, splitting the money each season. She said the amounts they earned are difficult to determine, but based on records in Carmack's papers, it appears that they made between \$100,000 and \$200,000 each.

Ms. Sheridan said that Carmack and his partners and their discovery have received lasting recognition: they were inducted into the Canadian Mining Hall of Fame and the Yukon Prospectors Hall of Fame; the Discovery site on Bonanza Creek is a Canadian National Historic Site; Discovery Day is an official holiday in Yukon Territory; Dawson City has celebrated Discovery Days since 1911 (August 12-17 this year) much as the US celebrates July 4<sup>th</sup> (parade, 10 K run, golf tournament, arts festival, salmon barbecue, mud bog)

Ms. Sheridan explained that in 1926, a few years after Carmack's death, the Seattle Alaska Yukon Pioneers commissioned the Northwest's primary sculptor, Alonzo Victor Lewis, to make a statue honoring the pioneers. Several models were used for this 3-foot statue, but the face appears to be Carmack. The statue is now at the Klondike Museum here in Seattle. A larger, somewhat different version was cast in 1947 and is now in Sitka.

She said Carmack came to Seattle in 1899 and invested in various properties and businesses. G. W. Carmack & Company (jewelry auction & commission firm); the Carmack Hotel (Togo Hotel, 307-311 Maynard Ave. S.), demolished; Maud Building (re-named the Carmack Annex), 311 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue S.; adjacent building (now a parking garage on Alaskan Way); 3007 E. Denny Way (demolished); and in 1909 built 29-unit apartment (Star Apartments, 11<sup>th</sup> & Spruce). She said he also owned another hotel earlier. She said in 1914, their income from their apartments and hotels was \$1000 a month.

Ms. Sheridan said in 1899 Carmack set up the Carmack Gold & Copper Mining Company and bought six claims (120 acres) three miles west of Snoqualmie Pass on the South fork of the Snoqualmie River. She said he built a complete mining camp with bunk and cook houses, barn, machinery, pumps and a 250 foot shaft. The first year or so, three shifts worked 24 hours a day. They smelted 1200 tons of ore in 1901, with a small return. He sold stock in the company and continued to work it for several summers, but it did not yield much.

Ms. Sheridan said as one of the primary figures of the Klondike, Carmack was involved in the A-Y-P Exposition. Most notably, he donated a telegraph key ornamented with 22 gold nuggets that was used by President Taft to open the exposition. The key was later used for other important events such as the openings of the Panama Canal and the Panama-Pacific Exposition in San Francisco (1914-15), and starting the generators at Boulder Dam. It remains in the White House collection today, on loan to the Smithsonian.

Ms. Sheridan said that for the rest of his life, Carmack was consistently recognized for his role in the gold rush and remained active in the Yukon Pioneers and similar organizations. Several hundred people attended his funeral on June 9, 1922. His estate was estimated at \$150,000, one-third of which went to his daughter, Graphie; his first wife Kate had died in 1920.

Ms. Sheridan summarized that the Carmack house is one of the few residences remaining with such a direct connection to a major figure of the Gold Rush. The houses of other Seattleites prominent in the gold rush, such as Erastus Brainerd and Thomas Lippy, have been demolished. This house is significantly associated with Carmack because it is the only building that is significantly associated with Carmack. Although he owned hotels, he lived in them only briefly. His previous house on Denny Way has been demolished. It was his primary residence for the longest period of his life. The fact that he lived here for “only” 13 years is not relevant. The important consideration is the role it played in Carmack’s life. He was a wanderer and it appears that this is the one place that he called home for the longest period of his life. While living in Seattle, Carmack was recognized as the “face of the Klondike miners,” and played a significant role in events. It may be the only property in Seattle associated with the miners, rather than the merchants and others. The criterion is not limited to only one person per event—recognition of other Klondike pioneers is very appropriate if such properties can be identified.

With regard to Criterion C Ms. Sheridan explained that Carmack played an important role in the Klondike Gold Rush, and the importance of that event to Seattle’s economic, developmental and social history is undisputed. The coming of the transcontinental railroad was followed by a deep depression that fell particularly hard on the Northwest. The announcement of the discovery of gold and the subsequent rush of people through Seattle gave the city a kick-start. The increased population and commerce brought Seattle greater attention from national financial sources and the confidence to make major improvements in the city. As a result, Seattle changed more in the decade after the 1897 than in any other period of its history. Seattle gained an early dominance in the Alaska trade, which other cities such as Vancouver, Tacoma and San Francisco were not able to meet. These quotations and numbers tell the story dramatically. She said the Klondike gold rush was a crucial event for Seattle’s development, and this house is associated with one of the key figures in the gold rush.

With regard to Criterion D, I Ms. Sheridan clarified the wording and said says “distinctive visible characteristics of a style OR a period.” It does not say or in any way imply that a building must be designed by an architect, that it be one distinct identified style, or that it not be from a pattern book or a kit.

Rev. Dennis Anderson presented Criterion D and said in the 1890’s and thereafter, Seattle’s residential fabric was primarily composed of single-family houses on individual residential lots. He said wood construction was generally preferred, using a mix of late-Victorian modes, such as the so-called “Queen Anne,” and more contemporary approaches such as what was at this time called the “modern colonial.” Exterior decoration tended to be minimal in Seattle, even in upper-class residences, with greater emphasis on membranous treatment in shingled and clapboard exterior surfaces. He said the adaptation of so-called “colonial” details and massings (gambrel

rooflines) was important in the development of Seattle's own residential architectural history, as was the emphasis on interior open and flowing floorplans.

Rev. Anderson said the conservative design culture in Seattle was on the one hand reluctant to move from established precedents, but on the other hand, spent more time adapting prevailing or waning national modes to new designs. As early as 1891, newspaper reports comment on a major house for Judge Julius Stratton in the colonial style, "quite a new departure in Seattle architecture, which has rather given itself over to the Queen Anne craze." (Seattle Times, 26, June 1891, p. 6). He said the Carmack house is an excellent and early example of these regionally-adapted and evolving design strategies, important as we come to understand the significant transitions that take place between nineteenth and early twentieth century architectural design modes in the Pacific Northwest, and especially in Seattle. He said the exterior massing and detail embody both earlier shingle style methods and point to the more formalized and archaeological interpretations of the later colonial revival. He said the exterior provides us with that architectural "missing link," so to speak. He said the interior organization demonstrates the transition from compartmentalized and hierarchically-sequenced spaces. He said the division between public and private spaces was common in most of the nineteenth century. This transition to open plan is usually attributed to the organization of the classic craftsman bungalow, but the transition happened here first. He said that this is also a middle-class house is significant because of the dominant culture of that group in Seattle neighborhoods and its under-representation on the landmarks register. He said there must be more to the architectural history of this city than high-end and high-style houses and that this particular structure speaks clearly, both in terms of its architectural vocabulary and its middle-class status, makes it worthy of designation according to Criteria D.

Board Questions: The Board had no questions.

Public Comment:

Jeff Eustis, attorney for the estate of Irena Jewdechenko, introduced Art Skolnik who presented a report (full report in DON file) on behalf of the estate. He stated the estate had received inquiries by a prospective purchaser of the home – a draft MOU involving Nickel Brothers, John Mace and the estate – offering to purchase the house with the purchase being subject to finding a receiving lot for the house and financing. He said the MOU was drafted by a person from Historic Seattle.

Mr. Eustis explained because Historic Seattle was a party in this proceeding he sent a letter requesting a recusal by Board members associated with Historic Seattle. He described the issue of from the perspective of both an ethics issue and one relating to the appearance of fairness doctrine. He requested recusals from Mr. Abelsen, Ms. Strong, Ms. Tremaine and Ms. Conti.

Karen Gordon said she had requested an opinion from the Ethics Commission and had forwarded the Ethic Commission's response to Mr. Eustis' inquiry. The determination was that the Board members past association with Historic Seattle was not a violation of the City's Ethics code. Ms. Conti noted for the record she hadn't been a member of Historic Seattle since 2007 and Ms. Strong noted that she had resigned from the Historic Seattle Foundation prior to her appointment to the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Mr. Skolnik provided his background with Pioneer Square and the Klondike Park. He said that while he is not an architectural historian he has friends who are. He said he did not have any hidden agendas-it's his opinion-take it or leave it. Mr. Skolnik handed out material for the Board members. He said the property did not meet any of the Landmarks Ordinance's criteria and that there was a lot going on in Seattle prior to the Gold Rush. He noted the importance of the railroad with the connection to the east coast which was important for supplies. He said prosperity would have come to Seattle anyway with the railroad, growth of the Port, and the Spanish American War for which warships were built. He said the Gold Rush was an event that came and went and that very few people came back with money. He said that others were more key in the impact of the Gold Rush on Seattle: Erastus Brainerd, Thomas Lippy and reporter Bariah Brown whose work was thought to have started the byline. He said a lot of players helped trigger the event and the Klondike was just another event. He said the increase in population was due to annexations. He noted Seattle Mayor McCaw and John Nordstrom went to Alaska; Nordstrom came back with \$13,000 and invested half of it in a shoe store. He said we don't have a house for John Nordstrom just the industry and the benefits of that industry to Seattle. He also noted Alexander Pantages who went into entertainment and built the first three theaters of his dynasty in the Seattle area.

Mr. Skolnik said that Carmack's participation in Seattle was "a token" and there was no record of his doing anything philanthropic; he said he was not a smart man. He said the moral rudder here was loose. He said what Carmack did here was nothing; he had done nothing but lose money and finding gold was not on his list. He said the fact that Carmack was honored at the AYP was not significant. He said Carmack was a fisherman, hunter, and trapper and mining was a fluke; he said Skookum Jim found the gold. In 1975 Governor Lewis suggested other properties outside of Pioneer Square be included in an interpretive center at Klondike Park and suggested a memorial marker be erected at Carmack's grave and the erection of a statue in Pioneer Square of the discovery of gold by Carmack, Skookum Jim and Dawson Charlie. Pioneer Square was designated an historic district because it represented a focus of the Klondike; he said Klondike, Carmack and Pioneer Square go together.

Mr. Skolnik said the style of the house has been referred to as a transitional style. He said it was a transitional period which doesn't mean it was a style. Mr. Skolnik said he took photos just roaming around the streets of Seattle He said there are lots of houses like this in the City. He said that we should be looking at the highest of the styles. He showed photos of the Queen Anne style evolving and other Shingle style-Queen Anne styles. He said there are lots of transitionals in the City and noted that landmarking should only be for properties that represent the highest style and that this was opening a Pandora's Box. He said the front dormer is sectioned and from inside it looks like an addition. From the back there are two dormers that are similar to one on the front and perhaps another one was removed to make a larger space. He said the dormer was not centered but askew. He said a lot of the architecture at the time came out of plan books. Mr. Skolnik said he went to the bookstore; he then proceeded to unpack stacks of pre-1902 planbooks from his suitcase and said many are similar to the Carmack house. He said he can't take his client's money and roam around the City. He said that 9,000 houses came out of plan books and said this house was a product of a plan book.

Mr. Skolnik said the association with Klondike is weak and Carmack should be associated in Pioneer Square with the Maud Building and not this house. Carmack didn't build it nor cause it to be built; he transferred his estate to his second wife so his first wife couldn't touch it. He said Marguerite (his second wife) was the generator of revenue, and Carmack walked into the mountains to play prospector. He said "soft history" was being created with this building and this man and it was not appropriate to designate the house. Mr. Skolnik said that he likes accurate history.

Mr. Eustis said it is not deniable the house was built at the turn of the century and was connected to Carmack. He said it has gambrel roofing with shingle details. He said that is not enough; the house has to have integrity and the ability to convey its connection to the Yukon Gold Rush and Carmack and there is nothing that does. It was not built or designed by him; it was owned by him and he slept there. He said there is nothing that epitomizes the connection to the Gold Rush. He said the style was initially offered as an example of Dutch Colonial and now it is referred to as a transitional style. He said it is distinct only as an amalgam and is a run of the mill example of pattern book housing.

#### Board Questions:

Mr. Savage asked for clarification in the chronology of Carmack's life and said page 3 (of materials provided by Skolnik) says "1902 built by Frank Goodhue picked from planbook". He asked on what basis that statement was made.

Mr. Skolnik said he didn't know which planbook but he found planbooks that came very close to that house and that he surmised it was a product of a planbook. He said it could have been an individual architect who also was designing but these were not designs that he came up with.

Mr. Savage asked a number of questions about Frank Goodhue who built the house.

Mr. Skolnik explained that Mr. Goodhue worked at the port; he sold the house to Isaac Himmelhach who rented out the house until Carmack purchased it. He said the house Carmack lived in during the exposition was the one on Denny.

With regard to Mr. Skolnik's statement that population growth at the time was due to annexations Mr. Veith asked which King County figures he had looked at.

Mr. Skolnik said he didn't know but that by this time Ballard, Fremont, the annexation of those cities was important to Seattle. He said services were important in annexations and up until that time Seattle couldn't provide water. He said he could get that information.

Mr. Veith noted that several areas joined Seattle to get services, not the other way a round. He said the population in 1880 in Wallingford was one – a Mr. Ashworth. He said the big growth happened post 1897 in that neighborhood. He said the area was added early and a lot of growth in the City happened at the turn of the century. Mr. Veith noted that Carmack was not on the alphabetical list circulated by Mr. Skolnik, of people who died or left the Klondike and said it is interesting because he was one of the few that came back with money.

Mr. Skolnik said people came out different ways and he was there much earlier than the Gold Rush as were a lot of other people. He said Carmack's going in was possibly never documented.

Mr. Savage said the list (provided by Mr. Skolnik) started in 1897 and the discovery was August of 1896.

Ms. Strong noted that neither Nordstrom, Moran nor Carmack (all prominent figures in the development of the City of Seattle) were on the list of stakeholders provided by Mr. Skolnik, and noted MacGraw was on a list of stakeholders (also provided by Mr. Skolnik).

Mr. Skolnik said he did not go through the list and it is from several sources.

Mr. Veith noted Mr. Skolnik stated that very few people came back with money and asked if Mr. Skolnik would agree that Carmack was one of those few.

Mr. Skolnik concurred and said that a "few" might be 2,000 out of 100,000.

Before opening up for Public Comment, Mr. Lee advised that comments must fit the criteria in the Ordinance and address the house's historic significance.

Public Comment:

Ms. Gordon stated written comments received by Staff have been copied and provided to the Board.

John Mace and his business partner Paul Ubbe said he is buying the house and said the house is significant historically and the history needed to be saved. He wanted to restore the house and said it needs to be moved. He wanted the house landmarked because if it isn't, it will be torn down. He said it is the story, it is the Carmack's house and is unique.

Mr. Abelsen read through the criteria for the benefit of the public.

Kate Stinebeck, Capital Hill Housing, supported designation and said it was significant of the Klondike and of Carmack's role in it. She said it is not disputable that he kicked off the Gold Rush. She said it is indicative of Dutch Colonial Revival style and has integrity; it is not substantially altered which is rare. She said it does rise to the level of designation.

Alex Zankich said Squire Park Community Council was the original sponsor of nominating the house. He noted the importance of the AYP to the history of Seattle and said it put Seattle on the map and showcased Washington as the International Gateway. He shared a copy of the original telegraph that President Taft sent at 3:15 p.m. on June 11 - 100 years ago which said "he trusted that the Exposition will fully meet the expectation of those whose untiring energies it owes its birth"; Mr. Zankich said he thought this was directed to Carmack. He said the preservation of historic fabric was important and said the Carmack House was rare and was 100% original. He said Carmack's character was not on trial and history has been written and he

asked that the house be designated. He said it is significant to Seattle, the Nation, and the State and to the Squire Park community.

Jennifer Meisner, Executive Director of the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation supported designation and said the Carmack House met several criteria. She said it is the only extant residential building association with Carmack and the Gold Rush had a significant impact on Seattle. She said the house meets criteria B and C: it is significantly associated with Carmack and the Klondike Gold Rush in Seattle. She said it meets Criterion D because it is one of the earliest intact local examples of use of gambrel roof and it is notably intact. She asked the Board to designate the house and to save the fabric of the City.

Barbara Stenson Spaeth, identified herself as a previous Chair of Historic Seattle Council and Chair of its foundation, but spoke on her own behalf. She urged the Board to designate the property as a landmark and said it is part of the fabric of the City and is connected to a significant individual who was colorful as most interesting historic personages are and not all of them are saints. It is an interesting architectural style which inspires one to remember what Seattle looked like not so long ago. She said that much has happened in that area and it would be heartbreaking if the property wasn't designated.

Michael Hershensohn, [former director of the Northwest Folklife and] manager of the City of Seattle's AYP Centennial Celebration, said the AYP was the moment Seattle "made it." Mr. Hershensohn shared an early *Seattle Post Intelligencer* newspaper article citing Mr. Carmack's role in the AYP. He said that a key was presented on behalf of "Donor George W. Carmack as well as on behalf of the committee of the Alaskan Yukon Exposition"; Carmack donated the gold that was on the telegraph key that opened up the Alaskan Yukon Pacific exposition. He said in 1909 – the year of the AYP Exposition – and showed Carmack's picture (along with President Taft's) was on the front page of the paper showing a clear association with the Exposition and at this critical moment in Seattle history, occupied the house now considered the Carmack House.

Carol Tobin, preservation consultant and past member of Landmarks Preservation Board, spoke in support of designation on Criterion B because of its association with Carmack because of his importance to Seattle and his role in the Gold Rush. Of Criterion D she said it embodies distinctive characteristics of a period of construction. She said the integrity is substantial, it can convey its significance and there are not many from that era still intact.

Leanne Olson supported designation and agreed that Carmack and the Gold Rush were important to Seattle's development. She said she visited the site and was impressed to see the amount of original material. She noted the melding of styles between Shingle and Colonial Revival and said it was reminiscent of the recently landmarked Ankeny House and also the Fitch Nutt house. She said she failed to see how the fact that a house may be designed from a pattern book diminishes its architectural significance. She asked the Board to designate the house.

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported designation. She said the Queen Anne Historical Society presented the Harry Whitney Treat house in the landmarking process to which Mr. Skolnik was opposed. She noted Mr. Skolnik's

comments about Carmack's low character and said he used the same words to describe Treat. She said over a hundred years stories change and she said one had to be a character in order to survive back then. She said whether he was or was not a character was not important; it is what he gave to this City. She said he gave us the wonderful history that Mr. Herschensohn just spoke about. She noted the photos of the site – 1937 and 2007 and said they are very similar. She visited the house which - although a bit tattered - still has integrity.

Virginia Voorhees Wilcox, former Chair of Landmarks Preservation Board, supported designation based on B, C and D. She cited Criterion D which states a building must exhibit the distinctive visible characteristics of a style or period, not both. She said it does not say or imply that a building must be designed by an architect, that it be one distinct identified style or that it not be from a pattern book or kit.

Joanna Cullen, Squire Park, said it is important to the neighborhood to have a relationship to the past. She said the house met all the criteria.

Sean O'Mear, Acting Superintendent of the Klondike Gold Rush, supported designation and said 60,000 people annually came through the Gold Rush Museum to learn about Carmack. He said many buildings are gone and this is tangible and is important to preserve.

Rick Sever, Historic Seattle Chair, said he has been a general contractor for 25 years and it is rare to find a house this intact and has this much integrity. He said although it looks like it needs a lot of repair, it is surface and is all repairable and fits Criterion D.

#### Board Discussion:

Ms. Conti supported designation and said it meets integrity (which, she said, was different from condition), it was a unique blend, intact, minimal alterations, and combined with such a colorful character in Seattle's history. She said yes based on B, C, and D.

Ms. Howard supported designation and agreed with the Staff Report. She said yes on Criterion B because of its association with Carmack. She said he lived there for 13 years and it is the only single family residence associated with him. She said he figures in the Gold Rush and the AYP. She said it meets Criterion C and said the economic history was complicated. She said the Gold Rush was important but also in culture as demonstrated by the AYP Exposition. She said the house does represent its period and so would fit Criterion D. She said the house has integrity and is distinctively of that period.

Mr. Lee asked if any of the Board members wanted to recuse themselves.

Ms. Conti and Ms. Howard said they didn't feel the need to.

Ms. Wirsching said the integrity is not in question and she struggled with Criteria B and C. She said she didn't believe it was associated in a significant way with the Klondike and Carmack. She said the house embodies the Dutch Colonial Revival

style as an early example of something that was starting to be indicative of that style so she supported Criterion D.

Mr. Peterfreund supported designation based on the Staff Report, B, C and D. He said the house had integrity. He especially supported Criteria B because of the association with Carmack.

Mr. Hannum visited the house and said it definitely had integrity and looks original. He said it had significant detail and if it was a planbook house the detail exceeded some of the things in the planbook. With regard to Criterion D he said it reads from its period. He noted the garage read like a carriage house. He agreed to designate the site. He struggled with Criteria B and C and said that it was Carmack's house but doesn't have to be. He said yes to Criteria B, C and D. He said the Squire Park neighborhood is underserved with landmarks and he also noted the importance of working class dwellings being recognized.

Ms. Tremaine supported designation and said that Carmack did file the first claim. She supported Criterion C and said Carmack was important during and following the Gold Rush including business in Seattle. She said the house is a mix of styles but has integrity and Carmack lived there for 13 years. She said yes to B, C, and D.

Ms. Strong supported designation based on B, C, and D. She suggested to the Board that it recommend the structure itself but not the site.

Ms. Gordon noted that the garage was not included in the nomination.

Mr. Abelsen supported designation based on Criteria B, C and D, noting the building's architecture, and said the builder added touches that made it significant. He noted the significant presence of the historic preservation community in support of designation. He said the house embodies its style and period. He noted the article presented by Mr. Herschensohn and said that the key is now part of national heritage demonstrates the significance of Mr. Carmack, and the house.

Mr. Veith said the house has a high degree of integrity and is close to its original appearance and its appearance throughout the period of significance. He cited several letters that cited Criterion A and said the building itself does not fit that criterion. He was not sure the house met Criterion B because the house was not built for Carmack nor was it altered by him. He said the house doesn't convey the significance. He said the house is typical of buildings built in that period of history in the development of the City. He said the Gold Rush was one of several events that resulted in rapid growth of the City. The building became the residence of one of the persons who was responsible for one of the impulses that led to the growth of the City, so he supported Criterion C. With regard to Criterion D he said the mistake people make is to look at the style manual and try to match a building with a style and said that most are descriptions "after the fact". He said the term "shingle style" was invented in the middle of the last century by a Yale professor. He said the Shingle Style was a transition from Queen Anne to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century styles including Colonial Revival as it appeared in the early 1920s – 1930s. This was an early "arrow" that pointed the way, and an embodiment of visible distinctive characteristics of that period and of a method of construction. He said he doubted it was a pattern book house – people eclectically adopted elements from different

styles. The designers relied on styles available in the lumber yard – lots of Queen Anne with Tuscan columns. He said this is an embodiment of the methods and predilection of designers of the period. He said no to Criteria E and F but supported designation based on Criteria C and D.

Mr. Savage supported designation based on Criterion D only.

Mr. Lee supported designation based on Criteria D and B but said no to Criterion C. He said Carmack is significant in Seattle history and this was his house.

Discussion ensued about which Criteria to base the designation vote and it was generally agreed Criterion B was critical.

Ms. Strong noted she served on the Historic Seattle Foundation board and resigned in 2007 and she did not renew her membership while on the Landmarks Board.

Ms. Tremaine was Historic Seattle staff from 1990-97 and is still a member.

**Action:** I move that the Board approve the designation of the George Washington Carmack House at 1522 East Jefferson as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards B and D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building and site.

MM/SC/VA/MH

**9:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Wirsching and Mr. Savage opposed.**

#### 050609.4

#### NOMINATIONS

050609.41

(former) First United Methodist Church  
811 5<sup>th</sup> Ave.

*Mr. Savage recused himself from the nomination consideration.*

Kate Krafft, Architectural Historian, presented the nomination report (full report on file). She provided context of the site and noted the small scale of the building in relation to large surrounding buildings. She went through the architectural details and the history of the church congregation noting that churches are an indication of community. She said this was the first church to be established in Seattle in 1853; the pastor was David Blaine. Carson Boren donated land for the parsonage and in 1854 the first wood frame church was built at 2<sup>nd</sup> and Columbia and was referred to as the “white church”. She said the congregation grew. In 1886 the parsonage and the church were sold to Boston Improvement Company. The Church moved uphill to 3<sup>rd</sup> and Marion where an elaborate pre-Gothic church was built; it survived the big fire. She said there were 11 other Methodist congregations by 1903. In 1906, with the regrading of 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and the residential character eroding, the property was sold to the Trustee Company who built the Central Building on that site. The congregation began planning for a new church and hired James Shack to design it.

Ms. Krafft noted the original Romanesque design and with the regrade of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue the design had to accommodate a grade change. She said that Beaux Arts style was

more widely adopted and was the prevailing trend/tastes of the time. In 1908 the cornerstone was set. She said congregation members worked on construction as day laborers. She pointed out the gallery where the women sat and went over the layout with its balconies, main level and basement. She noted the cornice is missing. She said in 1937 the front stairway and “cheeks” were changed and in 1951 the front stairway was changed again and the education building was constructed.

Ms. Krafft explained in 1968 the name was changed and redevelopment proposals were considered. In March 1985, the City of Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board (LPB) voted to approve designation of the First United Methodist Church as a Seattle Landmark based upon satisfaction of three designation criteria established in Ordinance 106348. The “Report on Designation” dated March 22, 1985 identified “the exterior of the 1907 building and the interior of the auditorium” as features of the Landmark to be preserved.

She said First United Methodist Church appealed the designation decision before the Seattle Hearing Examiner; however, the decision of LPB was upheld. First United Methodist Church then appealed that decision through the court system and the case was subsequently argued before the Washington State Supreme Court on September 27, 1995. On May 9, 1996, the Washington State Supreme Court ruled that, due to restrictions it had placed on alterations to the interior and exterior of the building, the Landmark designation was unconstitutional because it violated the rights of First United Methodist Church to the free practice of religion.

Ms. Krafft said in May 2002, the church congregation retained consultants to assist with planning for the redevelopment of the church property, including the demolition of the historic sanctuary building. Historic preservation advocates including Historic Seattle and the National Trust for Historic Preservation along with City and County elected officials and governmental representatives became actively involved in an effort to find an alternative approach, one that would preserve the historic church building while allowing the congregation to sell the property and relocate to new facility that would better serve its current mission. After much negotiation, on May 20, 2007, the church congregation voted unanimously to accept a purchase proposal from Kevin Daniels, president of Nitze-Stagen. The church congregation vacated the building in March 2008 and is currently preparing to move to a new church facility that is under construction at Second Avenue and Denny Way at the foot of Queen Anne Hill. The education wing (1951) was demolished in August 2008 and the southern half of the site is currently being prepared for major commercial development according to current zoning requirements. Daniels Development Co. plans to preserve and adapt the historic church building for a permanent new use. It is currently being used as a recital hall.

Ms. Krafft went through the building attributes and noted the central cross plan and the light buff pressed brick accented by terracotta; the Byzantine inspired dome, terracotta band – caps down in dome -, the high bas relief terracotta with lime covered ornament. The entrances are accentuated by segmental arches. Alterations included changes to the front stairs and in 1980s the banding.

Ms. Krafft went through interior details: segmental arches, windows, dome space with broad cornice and stained glass windows. She said the five sets of stained glass windows are distinctive with iconographic images.

She provided an overview of architects James Hansen Schack, Daniel Huntington and draftsman Olaf Hanson. She provided photos of a number of important buildings they had been involved with separately and also during their partnership.

Ms. Krafft said the building met criteria C, D, E and F.

Board Questions:

Ms. Krafft, in response to a Board member's question, said the White Church was the first church building in Seattle and the first congregation. They moved from 2<sup>nd</sup> and Columbia to 3<sup>rd</sup> and Marion and finally to 5<sup>th</sup> and Marion as urban expansion moved east.

Public Comment:

Larry Johnson, Johnson Partnership, noted it was an important nomination and agreed with all the Staff recommendations. He said it met a number of criteria and suggested that the Board's nomination acknowledge the role of the church in the State Supreme Court's decision to restrict the City's role in designating churches. He praised the owner for the nomination and said it would have been a tragedy had this building been lost.

Rick Sever, Historic Seattle, strongly supported the nomination and thanked the owner.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith recommended nominating the exterior and parts of the interior although the interior was not mentioned in the motion. Ms. Gordon explained the motion should say "include the exterior of the building" and take out "the site" and then include to the interior features listed in the staff report.

Mr. Lee asked what happened with the prior nomination.

Ms. Gordon said the designation never got to Controls and Incentives because it went to court. The church went directly from the designation meeting to court.

Mr. Veith said it is clearly an important structure in the City. He said it is an outstanding work of Schack and Huntington. He said it ties together so many elements of architectural trends of the time. He said it deserves to be nominated. He wondered if it was necessary to exclude the pews now.

Mr. Abelsen agreed that criteria C, D, E, and F were applicable, and supported nomination.

Ms. Strong agreed that criteria C, D, E, and F were applicable and suggested adding Criterion A based on Mr. Johnson's testimony.

Ms. Tremaine agreed that criteria C, D, E, and F were applicable. She said she visited it today and it is a wonderful asset to the City.

Mr. Hannum agreed that criteria C, D, E, and F were applicable, especially to criterion F.

Mr. Peterfreund agreed that criteria C, D, E, and F were applicable and commended the owner.

Ms. Wirsching to agreed that criteria C, D, E, and F were applicable and thanked Ms. Krafft for a well-written nomination and the owner for saving the building.

Ms. Howard agreed with the staff report and thanked the owner.

Ms. Conti said it was a great building and agreed that criteria C, D, E, and F were applicable.

Mr. Lee concurred and was glad to re-landmark the building. He supported the nomination based on criteria C, D, E and F.

Ms. Gordon noted that Criterion A wouldn't apply. There were two court cases and this was not "the" court case but was one of two. She explained why the pews were not included (the building wasn't a church anymore and the owner had plans for reuse). Mr. Lee concurred it was unnecessary to include furniture and said the windows and the space are fantastic.

**Action:** I move approval of the former First United Methodist Church at 811 Fifth 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 following interior features of the building: the sanctuary (excluding the pews), the main entrance vestibule, the formal stairwells in the side entry vestibules, the Pastor's Room, the balcony (excluding the pews), the organ and the pulpit; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for June 17, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

**MM/SC/MW/CH**

**10:0:0 Motion carried. Mr. Savage recused himself.**

050609.42

(former) Seventh Church of Christ, Scientist  
2555 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. W.

Char Eggleston and Leanne Olson from Queen Anne Historical Society, and Larry Johnson from the Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the nomination (full report in file).

Ms. Eggleston provided an overview of the years of work to save this building and stated they received much community support.

Mr. Johnson provided context of the area and how it fits into the residential scale of the neighborhood. He explained the two interconnected but articulated portions and Sunday school building. He pointed out the cast stone trim and edgings, the tripartite

windows with panels below, three entry doors. He noted the Byzantine repeated ornament and said the owls were not shown on the original drawing - they were supposed to have been lions. He pointed out the fine cast stone work. Mr. Johnson went over the interior elements – slate floor, dome, speaker’s platform, and organ loft. He said it did not meet Criteria A and B; C was a maybe. He said it met Criterion D and pointed out in photos how it is atypical to most Christian Science churches. He said it met Criteria D, E, and F. He said it was Byzantine Revival. He said it was designed by Thomas Granger and Harlan Thomas; he went over other buildings designed by them.

Ms. Eggleston said that hardly anything had been changed – only the Sunday school room – she noted even the old umbrella stand remains.

Ms. Olsen noted a slight alteration to the speaker’s platform, ornamental wrought iron railing has been moved, and original sorting room.

Dan White, member of the congregation, said they consider the building a gift and they are glad to take part in preserving and restoring it and supporting the landmark status. He said he spoke for himself on not on behalf of the church. He noted his wife did the courtyard design.

Mr. Lee said because it is a church there is reluctance to landmark the interior unless the owner is supportive as a group. He noted that the Board often nominates more than what would be designated.

Ms. Chave said the Board will have an opportunity to tour the church and Rev. Kelly will be available at the tour.

Mr. White stated they need to use the church in ways that meet the needs of the congregation but they don’t want to change the character.

Mr. Veith noted in the photos a couple buildings attributed to other architects. He agreed to email the corrections to Ms. Chave so the record would be correct.

Public Comment:

Rosealma Smith stated she attended Sunday school there. She said that Christian Science Mother Church in Boston rules over all the others and a congregation has to show they can fill the church up and then apply. The Mother Church reviews the application and decides if they will build and if so, the Mother Church pays for it and the congregation pays it back over time – that is why they are such nice buildings. She said this church promoted the whole neighborhood. She said the Sunday school area was never empty; all people from Magnolia came over to Queen Anne to go to church. She said the church was always full. Ms. Smith and her sister Heidi Carpine shared childhood memories of attending the church.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Conti supported nomination based on C, D, E and F and complimented Ms. Eggleston and Ms. Olsen on their great work.

Ms. Howard thanked all the presenters for saving the church and supported the Staff Report.

Ms. Wirsching supported nomination based on C, D, E and F and said it was significant church in its association with other Church of Christ churches around the city.

Mr. Peterfreund supported nomination based on the Staff Report, specifically D.

Mr. Hannum wanted to commend the presenters for their support of the project.

Ms. Tremaine supported nomination and thanked the presenters.

Ms. Strong supported nomination based on D, E and F and complimented Mr. Johnson on a well-written application and his pro bono work.

Mr. Abelsen supported nomination based on D, E, and F and said it was a fine building with wonderful detail.

Mr. Veith supported nomination and said it should be landmark.

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

Mr. Lee supported nomination and said it was a fantastic building; he complimented the presenters on their great work.

**Action:** I move approval of the (former) Seventh Church of Christ, Scientist, at 2555 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue West 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, the exterior of the building and the following features of the interior: the main entrance foyer including the two cloakrooms, and the auditorium, including the speaker's platform.; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for June 17, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

**MM/SC/MS/CH**

**11:0:0 Motion carried.**

**050609.5**

**CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

050609.51

MGM Building  
2331 Second Ave.

Karen Gordon presented the signed Controls and Incentives Agreement.

Action: I move approval the Controls and Incentives Agreement for the MGM Building at 2331 Second Avenue based on the Staff Recommendations.

**MM/SC/MW/CH**

**11:0:0 Motion carried.**

**050609.6 BOARD BUSINESS**

**050609.7 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator