



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 45/08

### MINUTES

**Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40th Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, January 16, 2008– 3:30 p.m.**

#### Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen  
Mollie Tremaine  
Marie Strong  
Mark Hannum  
Tom Veith  
Christine Howard  
Stephen Lee  
Alyce Conti  
Czarina Nicolas  
Ron Martinson

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Beth Chave  
Joanne Walby  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent:

Henry Matthews

Mr. Lee called the meeting to order at 3:35pm

#### **011608.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

December 5 and December 19, 2007

Mr. Veith made several corrections to the December 5, 2008 meeting minutes.  
Moved to adopt the minutes as amended.

MM/SC/VA/CH 9:0:1 Ms. Strong abstained.

*The minutes of December 19, 2007 were deferred until the next meeting.*

**011608.2 BOARD BRIEFING**

011608.21 Rainier Cold Storage and Ice Building  
6000 Airport Way S  
Briefing on emergency demolition

**Applicant Comment:** Jim Harmon of Sabey Corporation, and Brian Tokarczyk, structural engineer with KPFF, addressed the board.

Mr. Harmon gave the background on this project and why they are briefing the Board today. He said his company has given many briefings to the ARC over the past few months, including a site visit. He said they had planned on applying for a Certificate of Approval from the Board to demolish the Stock House. He said this building was built as a brewery and then was later converted to a cold storage facility in the 1930s. He said unfortunately, it was not adequately insulated over the past 70 years and as a result the ground beneath it froze. The ground has been thawing and heaving since they discontinued the building's use as a cold storage facility a few years ago and according to monitors installed last year the cracks in the building's walls have continued to advance. They had initially tried to get a permit from DPD without using the "Emergency" process, but since the DPD process has taken so long it is not considered an "emergency". He said DPD toured the site and ordered the owners to demolish the stock house immediately. He said they will shut down Airport Way this weekend and first take down the 2-3 bays off the building which sit 6' from Airport Way and then move equipment in the following weekend and knock down the rest of this building. He said the remainder of northwest wall will remain open and only remaining portion of the application that remains before the Board. He said this is a delicate operation because of the building's close proximity to Airport Way and high voltage power lines. He said DPD did not determine the boundary of what would be demolished and what would remain so they consulted with Landmarks staff, the demolition company and DPD and determined that they would "panelize" the wall into about three different parts and determine that about a third of the way down is a logical breakpoint reclaiming the stock house sign back to the Brew House. He said from a safety standpoint going from north to south was the only way to attack this building. He said also, there was a major fire 20 years ago and this wall was reinforced with CMU and then shot-creted so they will stage their equipment next to this wall. He said the question of the remainder of the northwest wall which is the predominant share that remains open and is the only remaining portion of the application that we have before the Board at this point. He said that his team will be back to the Board when the timing is right.

Ms. Chave noted that this is only a briefing today. She said in order for the Board to approve the demolition of the remainder of the wall that is not included in the Emergency demolition permit, the Board would need to review the new

building's design (Preliminary Design Certificate of Approval).She said the applicant is not ready with this design yet.

**Board Questions:**

Ms. Tremaine asked if they would be able to save the Stock House sign.

Mr. Harmon said it is still on the wall.

Ms. Chave said the portion of wall south of the sign will be demolished.

Mr. Veith asked if they were keeping as much brick from the demolished building as possible.

Mr. Harmon said they would do their best.

Ms. Howard asked if there was any trouble with reinforcing the wall.

Mr. Harmon said no.

Mr. Tokarczyk said the wall is intact.

Mr. Harmon said when they broke into the wall they found that it came down relatively easily and was not in any condition that would allow long term stability.

**Public Comment:** Holly Krejci, Chair of Georgetown Community Council, said they presented a letter to the Board. She thanked Sabey Corporation for being open to the community's concerns. She said they consider this wall to be a "protector" of their community as it provides shelter from Freeway noise and the railroad and wants the remaining part of the wall to stay. She said they are interested in seeing the preservation of the rest of the wall.

Mr. Lee encouraged Ms. Krejci and other community members to attend future Board meetings.

**011608.3 DESIGNATIONS**

011608.31 Bon Marche Stables  
2315 Western Avenue

**Staff Report:** On December 5, 2007, the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board voted to approve nomination of the subject property and scheduled a public meeting to be held on January 16, 2008. The Board staff recommends designation of the following features or characteristics: The exterior of the

building. This recommendation is based upon satisfaction of the designation standards of SMC 25.12.350 C and D.

**Applicant Comment:** Karin Link presented the application on behalf of the City. She said she believes this building meets criterion C because of its association of the development of Belltown, Central Waterfront, Railroad Avenue and the Bon Marche; she believes it meets criterion D because it is the last wooden structure on Western and First avenues; also she said she it is associated with the life of several persons important in Seattle history, the owners and managers of the Bon Marche: Patricia Brennan Nordhoff McDermott, Edward Nordhoff, Frank McDermot and Rudolph Nordhoff.

She reviewed the history of the neighborhood and noted that Belltown did not begin to develop until the 1870s when single family homes populated this area. Wooden structures were common until the Great Fire in 1889.

Ms Link stated that the subject building is of wood frame construction with wood clapboard siding and notable features are the raised parapet and cornice and some original windows. She noted that the street level has changed over time as it is a working building; it has a new garage opening and the window configurations have had some minor changes. However, the upper levels have not been changed and the two elevations retain the original siding. The alley elevation, not visible, has new vinyl siding and windows.

The building served as stables from 1908 – 1911 and was later converted to a lumber warehouse. The Compton Lumber Company occupied this building from the early 1950 to 1986.

**Board Questions:**

Mr. Veith asked if Ms. Link had discovered anything about Mr. Compton's significance.

Ms. Link said she had not, other than the fact that he owned this lumber company.

**Owner Comment:** Boris Castellanos, building owner's representative, and Susan Boyle presented additional information.

Mr. Castellanos said the owners of this building also owns and maintain other historic buildings, including the Guiry-Schillestad building, a City Landmark. He said they plan on caring for this building in the long term but don't support designation.

Susan Boyle distributed a report on this building. She said this building may have association with criterion B, C and D, but she questioned whether the significance was great enough to warrant landmark status. She said this heavy

timber, wood clad structure is located in the industrial areas between Western and Elliott. Historically there was some housing there but most buildings here were industrial and light manufacturing. The construction of Railroad Avenue and Alaska Way affected this neighborhood, along with the expansion of Bell street terminal and the viaduct that led to it. She said it generally represents the development of Belltown, but has not significant association with it. She felt that significance of the association with the owners of Bon Marche was minimal.

Ms. Boyle noted that stable buildings are associated with the use of horse-drawn deliveries which spanned the early century. She noted that as evidenced by a “shadow” door on the upper level that there may have been a wooden access ramp on the north side of the building, as well as the south side. She presented photographs of other stable buildings and said they were characterized by large access doors, simple, symmetrical composition and open interiors. She said this building served its function as a stable but was not significantly associated with the Bon Marche. She referred to the Union Stable (2200 Western Avenue) as a better example of this building type, noting the brick construction with special features and decorative horse bust at top of the façade.

Ms. Boyle said that multiple other businesses had also been housed in this building over the years: Savage Lumber, Medelow Company and Compton Lumber. She said that the subject building was a stable of wood frame single wall construction, heavy timber with a central aisle. She said there are few wood clad buildings like this in the denser part of the city due to fire and/or deterioration.

She said that there may have been a second floor ramp on the north side because of the shadow of beam ends that have been cut. The interior has been partitioned making it not representative of the original design. The two original facades, cladding and windows remain but all the windows on the north side are heavily deteriorated and rotting. Some of the windows have been filled in.

The interior of the building now serves artists, craftspeople and has been partitioned and sheet rocked and thus she doesn't think it represents any longer some of the essential characteristics of the stable building type. Although only the exterior of the building is proposed for designation, she said she thinks it is important that the Board question if the building retains the ability to convey significance as a stable building of wood frame construction.

### **Board Questions:**

Mr. Abelsen asked if the stable might have been on the second floor and if so could the building also have been used warehouse for store.

Ms. Boyle said she didn't know and that she hasn't seen anything that identifies this site was used as a warehouse for the Bon Marche.

Ms. Howard: asked if lumber company is a typical reuse of stable buildings.

Ms. Boyle said it is a multipurpose building because of the general open-space design.

**Public Comment:** There was no public comment.

**Board Discussion:**

Mr. Hannum: said he is not sure and that he would like to hear what the rest of the Board has to say.

Mr. Martinson said that there is enough integrity to convey significance of association with Bon Marche, that it was purpose built as a livery stable, so it meets Standards C and D.

Mr. Veith said that it is important to distinguish between integrity and condition and that the windows being in bad shape does not equal loss of integrity. He said that it is unfortunate that the interior has been altered as that diminishes the open loft characteristics of the building. He said he doesn't see any strong significant relationship with Bon Marche or the owners of that store. He stated that the Board should limit their consideration to Standards C and D, but even so it is still not clear cut. He is undecided and wants to hear what the rest of Board thinks.

Ms. Tremaine said that the building has an integrity problem and that there is no existing visible indication that it used to be a stable. She said that half the windows have been changed and a roll-up door installed. She said that the east façade looks like it could have been a warehouse, but not a stable. She said he wants to hear what other board members think. She is undecided.

Ms. Strong said the building is unique to the neighborhood and is the last wood structure in the area. She said the building conveys a unique architectural type that doesn't exist anymore. She said she is inclined to vote for nomination based on D.

Ms. Nichols said she agreed with Ms. Strong that it is the last remaining wood building in the area. She said yes to designation based on D.

Mr. Abelsen said he had difficulty determining whether both C and D are appropriate. He said the building clearly shows signs of the period of construction as a wood frame stable building type, but its connection with the Bon Marche and the Bon Marche's relationship with the city may not be strong enough for Standard C. Therefore he said he would vote yes based on D.

Ms. Howard said she agrees with Mr. Abelsen that the relationship with Bon Marche is not conveyed. She said he votes yes based on Standard D.

Ms. Conti said that the building does convey the method of construction and that she would vote yes based on D.

Mr. Lee said he would vote no. He said that the building does not convey significance to him.

Mr. Veith said that in reviewing all the information about the building, and putting this building in the continuum of the buildings that he has looked at while on the board, that he would not vote in favor because as there are other many other buildings that better convey their significance.

Mr. Hannum said he would not vote in favor as there are other better examples of wood frame buildings of this type in Seattle.

Mr. Abelson said that in going over the Criteria verbatim, he based his argument for Standard D on method of construction. It is a wood frame construction and continues to convey that method of construction, and therefore it meets Criterion D. He said it is the last wood frame livery stable building in the area and that this was a livery stable for a major retailer.

Ms. Conti said that it stands out to her as being a stable and therefore conveys its significance as a wood frame stable building type.

Ms. Tremaine said that the building is not extraordinary, and there is another more significant brick livery stable in the near vicinity.

Ms. Howard said that it is significant in that it is the last building of that type in the neighborhood.

Mr. Abelsen said that in comparing the two buildings in the area one is brick and one is wood, that these are two different types of method of construction.

Ms. Tremaine said that it isn't clear that this building was a livery stable and that perhaps it was a lumber yard longer than it was a livery stable.

Mr. Veith said that the brick stable looks like a stable that is trying not to be a stable whereas the wood structure is more typical with the central doorway. It is certainly typical of how these buildings were built in the time of the horse; this seems like a more transitional structure.

Action:

I move that the Board approve the designation of the Bon Marche Stables at 2315 Western Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

Move to approve: MM/SC/VA/CH 6:4 (MH, TV, SL, MT opposed).  
Motion carried.

011608.32 Puget Sound News Co./Terminal Sales Annex  
1931 Second Avenue

**Staff Report:** On December 5, 2007, the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board voted to approve nomination of the subject property and scheduled a public meeting to be held on January 16, 2008. The Board staff recommends designation of the following features or characteristics: The exterior of the building. This recommendation is based upon satisfaction of the following designation standards of SMC 25.12.350 D and E.

**Applicant Comment:** William Justen, speaking for the property owner, said that they own the property on each side of this building and want to redevelop the property. He said they talked with Larry Tompkins with Pioneer Masonry who does most of the terracotta restoration in the city, and that Mr. Tompkins had never noticed the building. Mr. Justen said the north and south facades are blank and the building is not so exceptional that it deserves designation. They have been through public process with the Design Review Board and have had two public meetings well attended by property owners and neighbors in the community. He said that the new project responds to concerns of adjacent property owners and this is a continuation of the public process they have been going through in order to redevelop the property.

Larry Johnson, in a slide presentation showed exterior details and stated that the terra cotta had been painted. He referred to the blank facades on the North and South sides. He said that Bebb and Gould were the architects and said that the interior main entrance vestibule and marble stairs remain as does the original skylight which is not significant. Under Criterion D it does embody the style and is a good example of Beaux Arts composition in the Collegiate Gothic Revival style. He said that Bill Booth, a local architect, wrote a book on Carl Gould and said that Collegiate Gothic is non-symmetrical with

vertical complex forms and shafts, pointed arch, stone or brick masonry, ornamental medieval motifs, and is generally used on the entire building, not just a single facade. He gave examples of building designed in the Gothic Revival style. He said that the Terminal Sales Annex Building compares favorably with other buildings though only in the main façade. It is clad in white terracotta which was likely supplied by a local company; he said there are lots of these buildings in Seattle. He said that the newsboy figures and flagstaffs, entry gates, original nameplate, interior shelving and fixtures, had all been removed, some of the original leaded window glazing has been replaced and the interior had been partitioned.

In attempting to apply the various designation criteria, Mr. Johnson said he thinks some of the design integrity is there to meet Criterion D, but wonders about structural integrity. He showed photos of other Bebb and Gould buildings in the City; University of Washington campus and the buildings nearby the campus. Gould joined the firm replacing Mendel in 1914 and founded the UW School of Architecture and became the Dean in 1915.. He did at least three sorority/fraternity houses as well as the University YMCA which is now Eagleson Hall. He said the Terminal Sales Building is a well-executed design but not outstanding when looking at his entire body of work so it wouldn't fit under criterion E.

He said that Criterion F is weak; it was a nice mid-block building but the mainly blank facades are visible driving up Virginia Street and the front view is the best.

He said that there was question about why the building was painted and he thinks this is related to seismic damage and turned it over to their structural engineer.

Michael Leonard with MLA Engineering said that his firm had been contracted to look at this (and other) building(s) following the Nisqually earthquake in 2001 and said that it was categorized seismically as moderate risk. He said it is a concrete framed building but it doesn't have elements that buildings would today for resisting seismic loading. He said that the hollow clay tiles had been significantly damaged and they are not reinforced to take that type of movement even in a moderate earthquake; most of the damage sustained was due to brittle elements such as the infill walls on the interior, and there was damage to the east elevation on 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. He said that he spoke with building engineer at the time, Steve Gorham, who described existing cracks that grew following quake and said that it would continue to get worse due to water infiltration, freezing, thawing making it a hazard to the public on the sidewalk on 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. He said their recommendation at that time was to take care of water infiltration problems that could occur. The repairs were cosmetic; material was injected into cracks and then painted over and the safety issue remains. He said that he did not get a report that any

seismic improvements had been done to the façade and in a larger quake the damage could be worse with the risk of façade material coming off the building. He said that he has had no subsequent involvement with the building since the original inspection.

Melody McCutcheon said that to fit criterion D the building must not just have characteristics of the style, but it must embody the style. She said that this building's characteristics, with three blank facades, 45' wide mid-block siting and terracotta cladding contrast with other buildings in the Gothic style such as the Mann Building which has two elaborate facades on two streets and is much more visually prominent. She said that this building does not appear to have been built to be a landmark. She said that regarding criterion E, this building is not an outstanding work of the architects, and that Bebb and Gould have done many buildings that better exemplify their work (e.g. Times Square Building, Fisher Studio Building; tremendous Gothic buildings at the University of Washington), she said that the Booth letter reinforces this. She said that the Terminal Sales building does not show significant character, or the historical value to convey its significance and that people just recognize the big advertisement on the side façade. She said that she has concern about cracking and loss of façade in a seismic event. She asked that if the Board designates the building that only the eastern façade be designated under Standard D so they owner will have flexibility and can come back later for a Certificate of Approval.

**Board Questions:**

Mr. Martinson asked if the building is concrete frame in both directions.

Mr. Leonard replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Martinson asked if any of the terracotta actually has come off the building.

Mr. Leonard said he had no evidence of terracotta coming off the building, but there were some loose pieces.

Ms. Tremaine asked if there were ever buildings on either side.

Mr. Johnson said that there used to be a diner on the north side at one time.

Ms. Tremaine stated that if that was the case, then building wasn't built as a stand alone building.

Mr. Abelson asked Mr. Johnson if he felt that mid-block buildings are less likely to be landmarks.

Mr. Johnson said corner buildings have a better chance to be landmarks.

Public Comment: Karen Link said that she has noticed the building. She said that terracotta can be fixed and cleaned and the fact that it was painted over does not mean that the façade has no value. She said that mid-block buildings were designed to have buildings built adjacent to them and therefore secondary elevations do not need to be fancy. She asked that the building not be punished for that.

**Board Discussion:**

Ms. Conti said yes based on D for the significance of the Gothic Revival style east façade, the elevation with the terracotta.

Ms. Howard said she is on the fence with regards to Standard D, but is still struggling with Standard E. She said that the organization of the facade seems to be very typical, a simplified version of the Gothic Revival that was used on the UW campus, but that it lacks typical iconography; the loss of the newsboys is unfortunate. The buildings that do stand out on the UW campus, Hutchinson Hall, Henry Art Gallery have very well developed iconography. She said she is undecided.

Mr. Abelsen said no to Standard E; he doesn't think there is enough evidence to prove that this is an outstanding work of Bebb and Gould. He said he is struggling with Standard D because it has just a single designed façade.

Ms. Nicolas said yes based on D. She said the style is engaging with decorative aspects at eye level and which are accessible to pedestrians.

Ms. Strong said she is on the fence but that she enjoys the building, it has a unique feel from the street and that she likes the arched window in front. She is not sure if significant enough to nominate it based on that.

Ms. Tremaine said that she would vote yes based on Standard D and that the building is distinctive and whimsical. The bay window in front is a very unique feature. She said she would be open to designating only the East elevation as suggested by Ms. McCutcheon.

Mr. Veith said that there is a difference between condition and integrity, and that if we allow structural condition issues prevent designation/recognition then a lot of landmarks would not be protected. He said that the terracotta and earthquake issues are condition issues not integrity issues. He said the exterior has a fairly high degree of integrity and that most elements of the façade are there. This was designed to be a mid-block building and appropriately planned. He said he doesn't think this is an outstanding work of the designer and would not vote based on Standard E. With regard to

Standard D, there are only two walls for windows and the design was chosen to get as much light in as possible and this was accomplished in a skillful way. He said he is leaning toward voting yes based on looking at subcategory of mid-block building and said this is a pretty good example of the style but wants to hear from the rest of the board. He is leaning toward designation based on Standard D.

Mr. Martinson said the building was meant to be a mid-block building and that buildings at mid-block were meant to have blank walls, he said would vote yes based on Standards D and F.

Mr. Hannum said that he would vote yes based on Standards D and E. He said the building conveys its significance as a mid-block building in the Gothic Revival style.

Mr. Lee said that this is a Gothic Revival style building with pedestrian level fenestration, and that being a mid-block building does not degrade its significance. He said he enthusiastically supports exterior designation. He said he recognizes that development was always intended to occur on either side of the subject building.

Mr. Veith said they would have to trust future boards to make appropriate decisions about surrounding development.

Mr. Justen asked if it was just the exterior and if it included north, south, west walls. Ms. Sodt said that the Staff report recommends the entire exterior.

Action:

I move that the Board approve the designation of the Terminal Sales Annex at 1931 Second Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

Move to approve MM/SC/TV/CH 10/0/0

Mr. Justen questioned if exterior of building included all elevations of the building. Ms. Sodt said that yes, the entire exterior was included. Mr. Lee said that any changes to the building could be applied for through the Certificate of Approval process and that based on preceding discussion it is understood that the building is a mid-block building with a single primary facade.

Ms. McCutcheon noted that the owners come back to present a number of design options for surrounding development, they will present options sensitive to the comments made by the Board.

## 011608.4 NOMINATIONS

### 011608.41 Washington Athletic Club 1325 Sixth Avenue

**Staff Report:** Staff recommends the nomination of the Washington Athletic Club at 1325 Sixth Avenue based on the following designation standards C, D, E and F. Staff recommends that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building. Staff does not recommend nomination of any interior spaces as there are no significant interior public spaces that remain intact.

Mr. Lee asked if any Board members were members of the club and if they needed to recuse themselves. Ms. Conti said she is a member of the club and asked if that was a problem. The club owner's representative said it was not a problem for them.

**Applicant Comment:** Kate Krafft, representing the City, said the building, located at the SW corner of 6<sup>th</sup> and Union in downtown Seattle, was finished in 1930. She said it is a twenty-one story building specifically designed for use as a private athletic club with guest accommodations (and continues to be used for those purposes) with five ground level storefronts and an entrance on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The principal façade is oriented to Union Street. The complex stepped back form with a base, shaft and tower. The building exhibits Art Moderne/Art Deco features, which are evident in verticality with piers and intermediate piers and bas relief sculpted terracotta ornament. Other Art Deco examples in downtown Seattle are the Northern Life Tower (1928) and the Exchange Building (1929). These are commercial buildings that are not only distinctive on the exterior, but have exquisite interiors as well. Due to economic downturn after 1930 major downtown commercial construction was halted and elaborate Art Deco designs for new downtown buildings were never completed. The Washington Athletic Club (WAC) was the last major high rise to be completed until construction of the Norton Building. The WAC building housed gyms, a bowling alley, exercise facility, swimming pool, social/dining area and 100 hotel rooms to attract members from outside Seattle. The club was open to men and women with women having a separate entrance. Sherwood D. Ford was the architect and he traveled all over the country to examine clubs to develop design including a Los Angeles club from which he took the idea for a 6<sup>th</sup> floor level pool.

Ms. Krafft said that Mr. Ford practiced for several years in Seattle designing the Whitman Hotel (in Walla Walla), Mayflower Theater later known as the Music Hall. W.D. Kormer who was developer of the Theater was financier of WAC so there was a distinct relationship between Music Hall and WAC. She

said there were two major additions, one in 1956 designed by Bain and Overturf and another in 1970/71 designed by John Graham and Company. She said the building is prominent from 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue for pedestrians. The principal façade with its major piers and intermediate piers, its verticality, windows and other elements reinforce the vertical character of the design. The fenestration reflects the interior uses: the social rooms with the large windows. There is a plaque dedicated to Hannah Newman, the original landowner, and sculpted by James A. Winn who did the Chief Sealth statue at Tillicum Place. The storefront on the east side has the terracotta surround intact; the other four storefronts have varying degrees of alteration although several still retain terracotta trim and speckled terracotta panels that are all the way around the base. Above the storefront portion of the base are terracotta ornaments, images and motifs that are repeated throughout the building. There are decorative patterns that seem to reference the letter “W”, and on the dentil course of the sill are fluted panels, and throughout a rope element. Plants are represented in many places on the building. Ms. Krafft pointed out the original window openings, but noted that the original sash was completely intact. The original entry was a recessed vestibule on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She said the raised portion of the parapet at the shaft base corresponded to the original entrance that was below, with repeated fluted motifs, stepped element, gargoyles and segmental arched windows, chevron type element, eagles at top of piers. The east and west tower elevations mirror each other. She said the window replacements at the top were changed pretty early on, originally they were narrow slotted windows.

She said there have been many changes to the interior; the grand entry was altered and all original fixtures are gone. The swimming pool is intact, although the exercise rooms have been continuously updated; the interior is not worthy of consideration. Original portions of 1930 high rise building meet several designation standards through the association of the cultural history of club; it embodies the distinctive Art Moderne and Art Deco styles; it is one of few remaining examples of Sherwood Ford’s work; and through the spatial siting and scale it is easily identifiable as a visual feature in the downtown core.

### **Board Questions:**

Mr. Lee asked if the detailing on outside is cast stone or terracotta.

Ms. Krafft said that the literature refers to it as terracotta but it could be cast stone, particularly the eagles.

Mr. Lee said street base looks like red granite and asked about the material.

Ms. Krafft said the material is glazed terracotta.

Mr. Hannum asked why original entry was altered.

Ms. Krafft said that it was moved as a part of the 1954 renovations. In the 1970 expansion it was moved again.

Mr. Veith asked if the two secondary elevations were planned to be blank.

Ms. Kraft said that on the south side they assumed a building would be built but the west side was perhaps built more economically because of the Depression.

**Owner Comment:** Jack McCullough spoke on behalf of the WAC and said they have been working to understand the process of landmark status and what it means. It is important to maintain flexibility as the club continues to evolve.

Jim Johnson, President and CEO of the WAC said they are proud of the building and its role in the community. It is the largest city athletic club in America with over 17,000 members, with a 48% female membership which drives the facilities and services they provide. He said they need to stay competitive with their business, stay current and reflect that which is contemporary.

He said the WAC has a strong community role in programs offered (Scholar Athlete Program with the Seattle School District, Middle School Athletic Program, Virginia Mason Heart Institute, Seattle Police Foundation).

Jerry Ernst, an architect, thirty year member of the club, and member of the board of governors said the building has housed the same use for which it was designed for seventy-seven years. The building has remained viable and functional in the community because of the ability to change the interior to meet changing trends. He said the most of the original exterior is intact; referring to photo he pointed out the two-story arched entry, retail store front, an awning was added in 1940s; in 1954 a four story addition was constructed and the entrance was moved to the new addition. In the 1960s the Hilton hotel built south of the club and the garage was constructed. In 1971 the four story addition was increased to the 12 story structure and a new awning was added to where the existing entrance is now. The entrance has not changed since the mid-1970s. He said the later addition has no historical significance. There are six storefronts which change frequently, following trends. The awnings are different, street level has changed and is likely to change in the future.

Mr. McCullough said that this is an example of adaptive use of the building over the years. He said there is nothing significant on the interior and the WAC needs the ability to modify the interior to keep up with trends so asked that the interior not be designated. He also asked that the newer addition not

be designated to allow the WAC future flexibility, and asked that designation be limited to the original 1930s building. He acknowledged that the storefronts have changed and the success of the stores depends on the ability to make changes.

**Public Comment:** There was no public comment.

**Board Discussion:**

Mr. Hannum said he would vote yes base on the staff report.

Mr. Martinson said he would vote yes, but would exclude the interior and modern additions.

Mr. Veith said he would vote yes and to exclude the interior and modern additions. He said with all Landmark commercial buildings the Board has typically guided building owners toward a flexible storefront system that is amenable to adjustments needed for various tenants over time. He said that staff would negotiate controls and incentives, and that the Board would take the same approach with regards to storefront design that they have taken with other buildings. He said that the WAC is an obvious Landmark.

Mr. Lee said he would vote yes, and stated that the Board always tries to be collaborative with owners and that collaboration is mutually beneficial.

Ms. Tremaine, Ms, Nicolas, Ms. Strong, Mr. Abelsen, Ms Howard. and Ms. Conti said they would vote yes.

Action:

I move approval of the Washington Athletic Club at 1325 Sixth 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 excluding the 1971 addition; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for March 5, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/TV/VA 10:0:0

011608.42 The Lenora Building  
2101 Ninth Avenue

**Staff Report:** Staff recommends the nomination of the Lenora Building at 2101 9th Avenue based on the designation standards C and D. Staff

recommends that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building.

Karen Link said the Lenora Building was built in 1924 for George Seibert. The development of Westlake is important to how this building developed. Transportation lines continued to transform Westlake Avenue; they shaped both downtown Seattle, the vicinity of this building and the areas north of downtown. The Seattle Interurban line and the City-wide trolley ran along Westlake. From 1908 to 1939 Westlake was an important section of the Interurban rail. In 1911 the phase prior to the final phase of the Denny Regrade was completed. During this same period downtown Seattle was moving north.

The original auto-row developed on Capital Hill but the second one was on Westlake Avenue and Denny Way. The automobile had a huge influence on how neighborhoods began and developed. By 1930s the Denny Regrade consisted primarily of framed houses, apartment buildings with a few framed churches.

*Mr. Martinson left at 6:40 pm*

Ms. Link said the building footprint is 120' x 120' with two stories and basement; exterior structure includes equally spaced engaged reinforced concrete piers (concrete is covered with stucco). The building has a flat roof and parapet. On interior the heavy beam and post structure includes regular grid of 16 x 16 posts, deep timber beams. The primary elevations are Lenora and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue. They have common characteristics such as engaged piers which are well expressed. There is a repeated ornamentation at the top of each pier. There is a continuous rhythm across the elevation. All the elevations have multi-pane sash windows at the 2<sup>nd</sup> level (except the back elevation). Storefronts were originally divided into three and are now divided into four. The transom lights are original at all elevations. The former alley elevation has few changes.

She said based on original drawings exterior has retained most design and original detailing. Architect Earl Roberts designed many buildings in the 1920s–30s: Stanford Apartments, University Manor, Malloy Apartments, and the Duchess Apartments. Owner George Seifert, was an official with the Great Northern Railroad from 1905 until 1940 or 1941. He showed up in Don Sherwood's account concerning Interlaken Park; he owned a picnic area along the West Boulevard in an area called "the Landslide".

The building has been associated with the automobile since the 1920s and has housed several tenants: Westlake Garage, The Guarantee Garage, Northwest Auto Repair, Empire Service Garage, Westlake Chevrolet (from 1931 – 1980s). Frank Potter Associates Printing took over the building in 1981 and

commissioned the first floor remodel design by Ibsen Nelson (1975-1987) which is an example of adaptive reuse of this building.

Ms. Link said the building meets Standard C based on the urban and economic development of Westlake; the last phases of the Denny Regrade; the development of Auto Row; and as a early garage building from the 1920s in an area at the time when there were relatively few. The building meets Standard D because it combines functionality and high style, the design is unique.

Ms. Link said the building was well-designed by Roberts and despite changes the building retains most of its defining features and qualifies it for Standard E.

**Board Questions:** Mr. Veith asked how the building fits in with garage and dealerships.

Ms. Link said not so much, that this is an early example of a warehouse/garage building in Seattle that takes traditional elements and does something modernist with them; it stands out on Westlake.

Mr. Abelson said if she would further her emphasis on modernist and high style.

Ms. Link said that the building has aspects of high style shown through the way the piers are expressed, the parapet, and the symmetry; there are just enough architectural elements to keep your interest going. The façade continues rhythm that is set up particularly on the Lenora Street elevation. She said she thinks this comes from education in architecture that is pre-modernist and adapted to utilitarian use.

**Owner Comment:** Vicki Clayton, of Cornish College of Arts said that Cornish does not support the nomination of this building and that they did not receive the report prepared by Ms. Link until the morning of the meeting. She said that Cornish is a steward of landmarks and that they are uniquely qualified to discuss what a true landmark looks like as they own, and maintain beautifully, other landmarks: Kerry Hall, was built in 1923 for Cornish and in 1977 Cornish nominated and supported landmark designation; Rasbeck Hall, which is the former Sunset Norway Hall, built in 1915; Cornish worked with the Board to do a full save of the building; and the former St. Nicolas School, a landmark, was recently sold to St. Marks instead of a condo developer.

Cornish does not support the nomination for the Lenora Building, because it does not embody great architecture; it is the lesser work of a national architect. There are no special or unusual features and many changes have

been made to the interior. Cornish plans to relocate there and will be impacted if landmark designation is approved.

Larry Johnson referred to a 1937 photo showing industrial steel sashes windows. The corner entrance was filled in to change the entrance. The Ibsen Nelson changes in the 1980s had nothing to do with historic fabric of building. The window sashes are aluminum now, all grade level glazing has been changed. At the alley elevation the only original glazing may be the transoms. Regarding Criterion C he said the building was associated with auto dealerships but only as an accessory. The ramps were removed by Ibsen and partitions added in 1981 thus removing anything that identifies it as a parking garage. There are several buildings in Seattle that are better examples of this type building so it doesn't fit criterion D. Building designer Earl Roberts practiced here a relatively short period of time - 18 years. He was a good architect but this isn't his best work; the First Church of Christ Scientist which is now the Rainier Valley Cultural Center, the Murray Motors building, the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, and his apartment buildings in the University District are his outstanding works. This building is not an example of his best work so would not fit criterion E. Regarding Criterion F, the building is visible from Westlake but has been dwarfed by new development, and it is only a relatively plain alley façade viewed from across an empty lot. It is medium scale with a relatively blank façade that lacks significant detailing. The changes that have affective architectural integrity are the removal of the original entry in 1937, the addition of ramp on the roof in 1941 the removal of all ramps in 1981; the addition of the partition walls as well as the removal of the glazing on the exteriors on Lenora and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenues.

He said he doesn't consider this building significant at all. He said this building is a Category 2 building in the Downtown survey.

**Public Comment:** There was no public comment.

**Board Discussion:**

Ms. Conti said she appreciates utilitarian buildings, but that this is not an outstanding example.

Ms. Howard said she agreed with Ms. Conti.

Mr. Abelson said that significant changes have altered its integrity.

Ms. Nicolas said she would not support nomination.

Ms. Strong agreed.

Ms. Tremaine also agreed.

Mr. Lee said that although it is a nice building, it is not landmark quality; it just doesn't convey any significance.

Mr. Veith said this is another case of a nice old building; it isn't landmark quality. He said he doesn't see the significance.

Mr. Hannum said he agreed that does not meet the Standards for designation.

Action:

I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Lenora Building at 2101 9th Avenue as a Seattle Landmark as it does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/TV/MH 9:0:0

**011608.5 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES**

011608.51 Eitel Building  
1501 Second Avenue

**Staff Report:** Ms. Sodt said that applicant has requested a 60 day extension; they are in the process of preparing an EIS. Ms. Sodt said that the owner clearly wants to negotiate, but that the owner needs more time.

Action:

I move to defer consideration of the Controls and Incentives Agreement for 60 days.

MM/SC/MH/VA 9:0:0

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator