



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 202/09

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4080

Wednesday, April 1, 2009 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen

Marie Strong

Tom Veith

Mollie Tremaine

Meredith Wirsching

Sean Peterfreund

Alyce Conti

Steve Savage

Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Rebecca Frestedt

Genna Nashem

Karen Gordon

Melinda Bloom

Absent:

Stephen Lee

Christine Howard

Vice Chair Vern Abelsen called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

040109.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of March 4, 2009

MM/SC/MH/MW

7:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Peterfreund abstained.

040109.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

040109.21 3829B S. Edmunds St.
(Columbia City District)
Proposed blade sign.

Rebecca Frestedt explained the request for business identification signage. The proposed flag mounted blade sign consists of two 15”h x 24”w dibond sheets attached to the existing stanchion with 2 ¼” anchor bolts. Black and Blue vinyl will

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

“Printed on Recycled Paper”

be applied to both side faces. Rounded edges will be painted black. She distributed drawings and photographs to the Board. She said the proposed sign conforms to the building's sign plan. On March 20, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for business identification signage.

Applicant Comments:

Ms. Frestedt spoke on behalf of the applicant and identified the building as live/work spaces with retail or office at the lower level.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Comments:

The Board generally agreed that the proposed signage met 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.

MM/SC/MH/TV

8:0:0 Motion carried.

040109.22

Island Soul

4869 Rainier Ave. S.

(Columbia City District)

Proposed signage and paint colors.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal which included the following: Retroactive approval of paint colors, applied to the awning and window trim; Retroactive approval of window decal signage consisting of the business name and logo. (Dimensions: 30”h x 23”w); Installation of a custom designed double-sided flag mounted aluminum cabinet sign (Dimensions: 5’h x 3’w). She said the sign will be attached to a tube frame base and steel mounting plate to be located above the canopy. Vinyl decal lettering and logo will be applied to the sign face. She said that no illumination is proposed.

Photographs, drawings and attachment details were provided. On March 20, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for business identification signage and paint colors.

Applicant Comment:

Roger Ligrano, Neon Electric Signs, explained the drawings and said the sign had been lowered and moved back 6” in response to feedback from the Columbia City Review Committee. He said it would project 3’6” out from the building.

Ms. Frestedt noted that the photographs provided by the applicant suggest that there have been some masonry repairs and bracing that has not been approved by the Board. She said the repair work was not part of this approval, but that the Board should take the current conditions into consideration.

Discussion ensued about the appropriate method of the proposed sign’s attachment.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Conti arrived at 3:50 p.m.

Board members were supportive of the paint colors and stated that they were characteristic of the District. The Board was supportive of the window decal and design of the blade sign; however, multiple members expressed concern about method of attachment for the blade sign. Members said that the manner of the installation should be reversible and should not damage the brick facade. Mr. Veith said it was preferred to minimize the straps, but that he would not object to the proposal based on the size of the straps.

Mr. Savage stated that he had concerns about the stability of the proposed blade sign and said that the parapet could be damaged in a windstorm if the sign was not properly installed. One member suggested that additional information about method of attachment be referred to staff for confirmation of structural security.

Karen Gordon explained that the applicant would also be required to submit an application for a sign permit from the Department of Planning and Development (DPD). She added that DPD will ultimately determine the structural integrity of the proposed attachment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage and paint colors with the proviso that the previously installed vertical straps are not included in this approval. The motion included a request by the Board to minimize the size of the bracing plates and a request that the applicant submit documentation to staff to confirm that the attachment is structurally sound. 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

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.

MM/SC/TV/MS

8:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Conti abstained.

040109.23

Bob's Quality Meats
4861 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City District)
Proposed blade sign

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposal to install a custom designed flag mounted steel cabinet sign (Dimensions: 3'3" h x 5'3" w). She said the sign will be painted white, black and red and include red pan channel letters with 12mm red neon spelling "Bob's" and skeletal red neon lettering spelling "Meats". The sign will be attached to a steel tube base and attached to a steel mounting plate. Drawings, photographs and attachment details were provided. Ms. Frestedt said on March 20, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for business identification signage.

Roger Ligrano, Neon Electric Signs, explained they would use exposed pan channel letters mounted on the surface of the sign.

Board Questions:

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Ligrano stated the depth of the channel letters was 2 1/2" and he referred to a material sample. He said this is typical for this type of signage. When asked for details about the attachment of the mounting plate in relationship to the shingles, Mr. Ligrano explained that the sign will be thru-bolted with shim behind the striated shingles and backer plates. There is a 14" exposure on the shingles.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board members agreed that the sign was acceptable and discussed the method of attachment. Mr. Abelsen recommended the applicant strongly consider removing the siding and do a more fitting adaptation. In response, Mr. Hannum expressed concern about destroying original lap siding if the siding was removed.

Mr. Veith commented that the design and placement appears to match similar signs along the street. Ms. Strong agreed and encouraged the applicant to minimize the mounting bracket.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage with the recommendation from the full board that the applicant examine ways to minimize the visual impact of the sign. 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

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.

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...Neon signs should be designed to reflect the unique nature of the use within the building. Mass-produced neon signs are strongly discouraged.

MM/SC/TV/MH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

040109.24

West side of 39th Ave. S.
(Columbia City District)

Proposed construction of a sidewalk on the west side of 39th Ave. S., and addition of street trees

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed construction of a new sidewalk to be built on the West side of 39th Ave. S. between Rainier Ave. S. and S. Hudson St. The project scope includes reconstruction of concrete driveways and curb ramps and the addition of trees along the side of the street. Approximately 2 parking spaces will be removed at the north end of the block as the road is narrowed to accommodate the sidewalk. See attached plans and photographs. On March 20, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for sidewalk construction and street use.

Doug Cox, SDOT Sidewalk Development Program, explained the project using drawing boards. He said the sidewalk at the intersection at Hudson will jog out a bit. Four Harvest Moon Maple trees will be planted.

Board Questions:

Responding to questions Mr. Cox explained this is a City-funded project. At planting trees will be approximately 10' tall and up to 150' tall at full maturity. There is a wide mix of trees in the district. For the majority of the sidewalk the existing curb

will stay but closer to Hudson they will tear out the existing curb and go into the existing strip a couple feet.

Discussion ensued about the types of trees in the District – there is a wide variety and the City Arborist selected the trees.

Ms. Wirsching asked if the paving pattern was consistent with what is in the District.

Mr. Cox said that along Rainier brick is used but this will be standard concrete which is consistent with the neighborhood.

Public Comment:

Frank Butler asked if the leaves will change color in the fall.

Mr. Cox said they would change to red and orange.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said the changes aren't damaging any character defining features.

Mr. Hannum said it would be an improvement.

Ms. Wirsching thought it was consistent and encouraged pedestrian activity.

Mr. Abelsen said it was an improvement and offered a calming affect on the roadway.

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.

MM/SC/MS/MH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

040109.3 DESIGNATION

040109.31 William Tell Hotel
2327 Second Avenue

Mimi Sheridan presented the nomination. She provided an overview of the hotel and said it is located on film row with all the important buildings within ½ block. She said it was built in 1924-26 and has had numerous owners. She said in the 1980s it was purchased by Plymouth Housing as an SRO. It has remained unchanged over time although it now has metal roofing and new windows on the rear. She said it has outstanding terracotta, extraordinary capitals, different shield designs and twisted columns. She said J. Lister Holmes was the architect who was best known for Modern works but his early work was primarily eclectic residences.

Ms. Gordon stated the building's exterior was nominated on February 18, 2009. She said the staff recommendation is based on Criteria C, D and E. She reviewed the criteria.

Board Questions:

In response to a clarifying question Ms. Sheridan said the terracotta is an unusually rich example and is the best next to the Sovereign Apartments.

Public Comment:

Kurt Fisher, owner, had questions about the process for signage and parameters for addressing. He appreciated the architecture having been preserved and will be taking the building back to its original use as a hotel. He said the Cedar trees are not original and they are looking at replacing them in the future.

Ms. Gordon explained the site would not be designated – just the building's exterior – and the Board won't have jurisdiction over the trees.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum supported designation based on C, D, and E. He said it was a wonderful building and he was pleased it would be returned to its original use. He expressed support for a Film Row District.

Ms. Wirsching concurred with the Staff Report of C, D, and E. She said the building was outstanding and unique and not typical of Lister Holmes' work.

Ms. Strong was supportive of designation based on the Staff Report of C, D, and E and said it was wonderful to have an engaged building owner. She appreciated the Film Row community that is coming together there.

Mr. Veith supported designation based on Criterion D and said the building had a very nicely designed façade, terracotta and decorative masonry; it was attractive and original. He supported designation based on C and said that E was on the edge.

Ms. Tremaine agreed with the Staff Report and commented on the unique architecture and happy that is part of a little community that is developing there and was charming.

Mr. Peterfreund supported designation, agreeing with the Staff Report of Criteria C, D and E.

Mr. Savage supported designation based on C, D and E. He thought the Film Row was fascinating part of Seattle history.

Ms. Conti supported designation and said the terracotta was remarkable and was happy the building would go back to its original use.

Mr. Abelsen said it is an outstanding work of the designer and the building stands as a landmark. He supported designation.

Action: “I move that the Board approve the designation of the William Tell Hotel at 2327 Second Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building”

MM/SC/MW/SS

9:0:0 Motion carried.

040109.41

NOMINATION

040109.41

George Washington Carmack House
1522 E. Jefferson St.

Alex Zankich, Squire Park Community Council, explained that the Squire Park Community Council nominated the house and said preserving it is important to the neighbors and the Council. He said it is located in the center of Squire Park and is important to the history of the City and Nation.

Kathleen Brooker, Historic Seattle, said the exterior is extremely important and that the National Park Service was in attendance to speak to the national significance of the site. She said Historic Seattle believes it is important locally and has stepped forward to be of assistance to the estate in finding a buyer for the property as it is constrained in its site. She said they will also assist the buyer in locating a parcel and financing.

Mimi Sheridan presented the nomination report (full report on file). She provided context of the site and character of the neighborhood. She said the house was built in 1902 and the Carmacks bought it in 1909. She said in the late 1890's the area grew rapidly because of the street car lines. She said the area has always been an ethnically diverse area and has always had a variety of residential and institutional uses. She said the house currently sits between Providence Hospital and a parking garage.

Ms. Sheridan provided an overview of the Klondike Gold Rush which started in the United States in 1897 and the role Seattle played as a gateway to the Klondike. She

said it was during a period of recession and Seattle hired a promoter, Erastus Brainerd, to send word around the country and spread the word that Seattle was the place to come if one wanted to go find gold. She said Seattle had Transcontinental Railroad making it easy for people to get here relatively easily, there was a port for ships going to Alaska, shipyards to build ships that were needed, agriculture, manufacturing, foundries, and dried foods to be used as provisions. About 100,000 people went to Alaska trying to get to the Klondike; 70% of them are estimated to have come through Seattle purchasing provisions. She said the Assay office was constructed and \$174 million in gold went through it in five years. She summarized the impact of the Gold Rush on the City at the time the house was built: stronger industries and commerce, Alaskan trade, services and entertainment and set the foundation for city development and amenities.

Ms. Sheridan said George Carmack was a character – a scalawag and a rogue – and was among the first to discover gold in the Klondike. She said although there is debate about whether he actually discovered the gold – he was with a group of people - he filed the first claim and announced the find because women and Native Americans couldn't file. She said those who became rich were those already in Alaska. Carmack was one of the few miners to return to Seattle and one of the few to make a fortune mining up there. She said he is widely recognized as a pioneer and became the “face” of the gold miners. She said he was active in AYP which was tied to gold.

Ms. Sheridan said the house was built in 1902 by Severt Shults for Frank Goodhue. Goodhue managed the Arlington Dock which was the major dock used for Alaska trade. She said the house was purchased by the Carmacks in 1909. She said Mr. Carmack died in 1922 and a few years later his wife moved to California but retained ownership of the house. She said the house was purchased by the Jewdechenkos in 1958 who were very interested in the history of the house.

Ms. Sheridan described features of the house: gambrel roof, full width porch, recessed porch, brick foundation, Tuscan columns at porch, almost all windows are multi-paned, corbelled brick chimney, and oriel window on east façade. She pointed out the shingle work and the Colonial-inspired dormer. She said there are a couple new windows on the rear façade but the rest are original. She pointed out the dormer with three windows, shingle detail, full width porch with columns, oriel windows and noted these elements made the house stand out. She reviewed the Dutch Colonial Style elements that are typically seen in Seattle are the gambrel roof, shed dormer, Colonial detailing. She said these were very common in the 1920s but that this house is different because it is very early for this style. She said this is an early example of Dutch Colonial heavily influenced by the Shingle style.

Ms. Sheridan said the house meets Criterion B because George Carmack played a significant role in the Klondike Gold Rush as the first person to file a claim and announce the find. She said he was one of the few people important in the Gold Rush who came back to live in Seattle. She said he lived his later life in Seattle and this house was his last remaining and longest residence. She said the house meets Criterion C because the Klondike Gold Rush was significant to Seattle as the earliest development leading to economic and population growth and gave it a place on the national and international stage. She said it meets Criterion D because it is notable as

an early example of the Dutch Colonial Revival Style and of the transition from Queen Anne Shingle Style to the Dutch Colonial Style.

Board Questions:

Ms. Strong noted that the interior was not discussed and she was unable to look in the windows.

Ms. Sheridan stated the interior was not included in the nomination.

Responding to a Board member's question Ms. Sheridan said the County records have different date listed for the house – 1890 or 1900. She said the earlier date is in the National Register nomination.

Ms. Sheridan deferred questions to Rick Sever of Historic Seattle.

Rick Sever, Historic Seattle, said he is an architectural historian and general contractor specializing in pre-1960 houses. He responded to a Board member's question and said despite what looks like a lot of damage to the exterior there is a significant amount intact surface. He said some things are rotted but are easily reproducible and if one was to save as much as possible about 70% original material could be left. He said the exterior is highly restorable.

Ms. Sheridan explained Carmack also owned what is now the "Maud Hotel" downtown.

Mr. Veith asked about the modillions that were removed from the dormers; he wondered if those were rafter tails and if there was any evidence that the soffits were enclosed.

Ms. Sheridan said they were an applied element.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the house was an early example of the Dutch Colonial style and wondered if there were any other buildings representative of this style.

Ms. Sheridan said in the database there are some houses from this period that are similar – they have gambrel roofs but are not exactly Colonial Revival.

Mr. Abelsen asked if this was one of the few remaining houses of the Klondike and who or what other properties might be represented.

Ms. Sheridan cited the book "Hard Drive to Klondike" and said they looked for the houses of Erastus Brainerd, Mayor William Woods, Tom Lippey; the Brainerd and Lippey houses are gone and Woods' apartment has been heavily altered.

Gretchen Luxemburg, National Parks Service, identified Gold Rush era buildings outside Pioneer Square Historic District – nine have been identified (one of which is the Carmack House) and six of those are already landmarks and listed in the National Register.

Ms. Sheridan added that one of those was the Assay Office.

Owner Comments:

Jeff Eustis, attorney for the estate, introduced Tatiana Favid as the personal representative the estate; he said her parents knew Irene Jewdechenko, the former owner.

In response to numerous questions posed by Mr. Eustis, Ms. Favid explained she did not want the house nominated because it does not satisfy the criteria. She said there is nothing about the house that conveys significance of Carmack and there is no integrity to convey the style. Ms. Favid said the estate is in not any position to restore or reconstruct the house. She said it is the estate's fiduciary responsibility is to sell the property and distribute the funds to beneficiaries.

Mr. Eustis said he included the police report of the architectural theft that occurred in early January and provided before and after theft photos of interior. He asked Ms. Favid if attempts to find the stolen items had been successful and she said "no". He cited a letter he had sent that said they do not support the nomination because the house does not meet the criteria cited in the letter. He said there is nothing about this house that conveys anything about the significance of George Washington Carmack and that the house does not have the integrity to convey the Dutch Colonial Revival Style.

Art Skolnik said he was contacted by the estate and Jeff Eustis to look at and provide an opinion on the nomination. He said there were many deficiencies in the nomination and he went on to provide an overview of his resume and passed out a number of articles to support his arguments. He said one must understand the Klondike and the City to understand the impacts. He provided photos of Dutch Colonial style houses and said it was an abundant style and was prolific, not unique. He said during time of rapid growth plan books were used and to build houses quickly kit houses were used. He said this house is a product of a plan book not high style of Dutch Colonial and is one of hundreds built at the time.

Ms. Conti asked if he had a list like the one he passed out but with the years the houses were built listed.

Mr. Skolnik said no but the information could be easily cross-referenced – there were eight or ten early houses of that variety.

Ms. Conti asked if he was hypothesizing that the Carmack house was factory built.

Mr. Skolnik said yes and he would be amazed if it wasn't. He didn't have the book but there are examples that come close to this style. He went on to discuss the Klondike event and said Seattle was depressed coming into the Gold Rush time. He said almost simultaneously with the Gold Rush the extension of the railroad from Tacoma to Seattle brought in lots of traffic and people. He went on to describe Erastus Brainerd who was single-handedly responsible for Seattle being what it is today. He said he took the idea of the railroad and gold coming from Alaska and promoted it all over the world. He said Seattle became the pre-eminent supplier of supplies and equipment to Alaska. He said the Gold rush only lasted a few years and that other things were happening at that time that had more impact on the City (the

railroad, the Spanish American war). He said miners had been Alaska for years but kept it quiet until the claim was filed and then other miners went over and booked up everything. He said that Carmack was not the first miner but he did file the first claim; he was not involved with the impact that the Klondike had on Seattle – it was Brainerd.

Mr. Abelsen asked if Mr. Skolnik agreed that Carmack filed the first claim.

Mr. Skolnik concurred.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the telegraph key commissioned by Carmack which is now at the White House.

Mr. Skolnik responded that Carmack designed it and it was used but he didn't know where the key was now.

Mr. Abelsen noted that Mr. Skolnik said there were deficiencies in the report and that he was trying to determine what those were. He said wasn't sure that Brainerd was germane to this discussion.

Mr. Skolnik stated that Brainerd was promoting the City and Carmack was just a miner who filled his pockets and came here and spent a lot of money. He said Carmack had no integrity. He said Carmack had no scruples on what he had to do to put his name forward.

Ms. Conti said Sears didn't enter the catalog home business until 1908 and Wards was 1910. She stated she was trying to ascertain if the house was crafted or pre-fab.

Mr. Skolnik said there were other companies but he hadn't had time to find examples of the others which were abundant and in other styles as well. He stated he thought the growth all started with the railroad in 1898 and the other lucky event for Seattle was the Spanish American War with the ability to bring the fleets in. He said Seattle became a military post in 1903. He said the railroad was the conduit to get the city supplied and built. He went on to summarize Carmack's life and questioned whether or not Carmack found the gold or if he was the first to file a claim only because he was the only white male in the group (the only person who could file). He said Carmack had no parents, no ambition, no role model, and that he was pretty good at getting by.. He said the house did not meet any of the criteria – the house wasn't built for him and Carmack didn't live there very long. He said if nominated he requested it be done without the site so the house could be moved.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if this house is found in any of the catalog.

Mr. Skolnik stated he hadn't the time to look.

Mr. Veith asked if the issue of who discovered the gold were settled would that person's house be more significant than this house.

Mr. Skolnik said it would not; what is important is what happened to the City. He said picking out a house is ridiculous.

Ms. Tremaine asked if there was anyone else in City renown for the Klondike.

Mr. Skolnik stated that there were several people and that even the Mayor went there.

Public Comment:

Rick Sever spoke in support of nomination. He said in the majority of Dutch Colonial houses, the mansard roof was straight and this one is scooped which he thought to be significant. He agreed that this is a descendant of the Shingle Style because of the asymmetric pattern and the different patterning of the shingles throughout. He said the brick foundation looks to be about 10-20 years old.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historic Society, noted the prevalence of Dutch Colonial style in Seattle; it was shown in 1904 plan books, reaching its peak popularity in the 1920s. She said built in 1902 this house was on the leading edge of the style.

Karen Buckler Dorn, Klondike National Park Superintendent, spoke in support of the nomination. She provided an overview of the Klondike National Park which commemorates the Gold Rush as a significant event – socially and economically. She described Carmack as a rogue – a man of his times in the last great frontier. She said Carmack filed the first claim for Klondike gold so is the person most often credited with the great discovery. She said the house was his longest known residence in Seattle and was purchased with Klondike gold. She said the structure is a tangible artifact of his life and provides interpretive opportunities that can't be duplicated elsewhere. If lost, it is gone forever. She said due to legislative regulations and the direction of the Klondike National Park, they are not interested in purchasing or managing the house but they are interested in and committed to working with any owner or potential owner to bring history to life for the Carmack House. She supported nomination.

Gretchen Luxemburg, National Parks, supported nomination and stated the house had integrity. She said nine Gold Rush era properties outside of the Historic District were identified; six of those are already listed in National Register or Seattle Landmarks and the Carmack house is one of the other three. She said it was one of two homes that he lived in and the other one has been torn down. She said it was Carmack's last residence. She said Irene Jewdechenko told her she desired it to be listed in the National Register so the National Park Service initiated the process but it wasn't finished before her passing.

Mark Funk, Probate Attorney for Jewdechenko estate and said he knew Mrs. Jewdechenko and discussed her estate with her prior to her passing. He explained her will shows her intention to leave money to charities and that this process is holding that up. He disagreed that Ms. Jewdechenko wanted the house listed in the National Register.

Paul Ubbi stated he is interested in purchasing the house with the designation with his business partner, John Mase.

Joanna Cullen said it important for the community to have a sense of history because so much is torn down. She said despite Carmack's reputation he is the face of the miner, a wanderer who was not well educated and who is an important part of the American story.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Conti supported nomination based on the Staff Report. She was disturbed by the theft of the architectural elements and said a significant part of history had been lost which couldn't be retrieved. She said Carmack was a man of his time; he did the work and filed the claim – the rest is hearsay. She said this was his longest known residence. Dutch Colonial style started in 1900 so this is early for that style. She said it had a lot of interesting elements such as the asymmetry. She said none of the other catalog companies had catalogs out prior to the time the house was built so unless this is an extreme off brand that is not documented – which is highly unlikely - this was not a catalog house.

Mr. Savage said he did not think the house met Criteria B, C or D. He didn't think Carmack was significant in any other way except for being the first claimant. He said the house was built prior to Carmack purchasing it and is not a unique example of Dutch Colonial. He said it was not an outstanding example. He did not support nomination.

Mr. Peterfreund was not convinced either way. He said Criterion C is the strongest, D is the weakest. He supported nomination to keep the opportunity open.

Ms. Tremaine wasn't sure about the house meeting Criterion B and although she didn't think that fact was important she didn't know if he actually found the gold but he is associated with the Klondike Gold Rush. She said with regard to Criterion C, the Klondike itself was an important economic development in the history of the City. She said the house met Criterion D as a shingle style house in the transition period to Dutch Colonial which was significant. She said the house met Criterion F as an identifiable feature of there neighborhood. She supported nomination.

Mr. Veith said with regard to Criterion B the house was Carmack's for a time. He said in terms of significance to the City he was different in quality from what we often regard as a mover and shaker. He said he was a different type of character who just happened to be in the right place at the right time. He said he wasn't significant enough for landmarking. With regard to Criterion C, he said the house was one of a large number of houses built and was more connected as a structure with the development of a community and is not more significant than others. He said the house had a gambrel roof but without symmetry or regularity of a Dutch Colonial house. He would have marked this as a Shingle Style pre-figuring future development. He said it does embody character of style but wasn't sure if that made it landmark-worthy. He said it is a unique house with its asymmetrical placed bay dormer, Tuscan columns and long porch. He said it embodies many characteristics of the style and period. He supported nomination because he wants time to look through everything.

Ms. Strong supported the nomination and noted the importance of reviewing the materials. She supported nomination based on B and D but said no on C.

Ms. Wirsching said landmarking was about a building not a person. She said while the house was associated with Carmack it was not built for him. She said the house is not unique and is one of many. She said Criterion D is the most plausible criterion; she was not sure it was worthy of landmark status. She did not support nomination.

Mr. Hannum agreed to nominate in order to digest more information. With regard to Criterion D he thought this was a Shingle Style and that it is distinctive and has ability to convey significance.

Mr. Abelsen agreed there was a lot of information to digest. He said it was a challenge to connect the person to the house. He supported nomination. He said the thievery was very unfortunate and hoped due process would be served. He said it was clear to all that the Klondike Gold Rush was extremely significant to the City and Nation and internationally as well. He said the building is a quality deserving landmark status. He may consider Criterion F and possibly the site as well.

Action: I move approval of the George Washington Carmack House at 1522 E. Jefferson Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building and the site; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for May 6, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MH/TV

7:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Wirsching and Mr. Savage opposed.

040109.5

CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

040109.51

Metropolitan Press Printing Co./Brasa Building
2107 Third Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Gordon explained that a one year extension was requested until the first meeting in April 2010.

Action: I move to extend the period of consideration of the Controls and Incentives for the Metropolitan Press Printing Co./Brasa Building for a period of one year, the first meeting in April 2010.

MM/SC/TV/MH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

040109.52

Japanese Language School
1414 S. Weller St.

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

Action: I move to extend the period of consideration of the Controls and Incentives for the Japanese Language School for a period of four months.

MM/SC/TV/AC

9:0:0 Motion carried.

040109.6 BOARD BUSINESS

040109.7 STAFF REPORT

Ms. Chave explained that the mock up for the Aurora Bridge had just been viewed and photos were available on WASHDOT website. This was to provide a sense of scale of what is being proposed. ARC will respond to what they saw at the next ARC meeting. She said word was sent out to community groups as well as the Neighborhood Service Center.

Mr. Veith noted that some neighbors were in attendance.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator