



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 185/08

MINUTES

**Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, March 19, 2008– 3:30 p.m.**

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom

Stephen Lee, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:33pm.

031908.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of February 6, 2008

MM/SC/TV/MS
members.

11:0:0 Minutes approved with corrections by Board

031908.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

031908.21 US Immigration Building
84 Union Street

Applicant Comments:

Steve Yoon with Harbor Properties said he came to the Board several months ago seeking approval of the project which is a conversion of the old youth hostel to apartments. Using photos he showed the location of the building in relation to

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Western and lower Union Streets and pointed to where the new Four Seasons Hotel is being built. He said the hill climb going up lower Union is new as are a plaza area and fountain which is planned as a tourist destination view “look-out”. He said the existing railings were done in 1987 so are not original; they are not attached but are associated with the building.

Mr. Yoon passed out a rendering of what the Four Seasons has done showing what they call “upper Union” and showing the proposed railings to give the Board an idea of what is proposed for 84 Union. He said the sky bridge railings from the 1987 upgrade are green tube steel; it is a horizontal orientation. He said the last time he came to the Board he proposed to keep the existing orientation and just refinish. He said now that the Four Season development has a new railing system, he thought it appropriate to carry that design on to the sky bridge. He said in parallel to this presentation they suggested this to the National Park Service and it was approved. He said they then looked at the lower Union entrance, which is the historic entrance and will essentially copy what they do on Upper Union to the entrance. He said the terracotta will remain untouched.

Ms. Sodt said the construction details are in the packets.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked Mr. Yoon to hold up the board with the two railings and said it looks like there is a turn in the bridge; he asked if it is actually bent or if the bend is due to the photo-montage not being perfect.

Mr. Yoon said it is an exact photo so perhaps it is an illusion.

Ms. Sodt clarified that there is no articulation there.

Mr. Yoon said he doesn’t know but the photo seems to indicate some articulation.

Mr. Veith referred to the lower photo and asked if they are aligning one of the vertical support stanchions with the break.

Mr. Yoon said he thinks it is just to match the spacing of how the picket orientation is with the Four Seasons which is designed by NBBJ; he said if one compares the digital photo with what the Four Seasons is presenting there is a break.

Mr. Veith said he understands the new railing design but the drawing is unclear.

Mr. Lee said it is a spliced photo and that is why it appears bent. He said the I-beam is a straight line and that is why it is confusing. Photos have been spliced together so it appears bent.

Mr. Abelsen said the sky bridge is coming across from a newer building and they are relating that to that; he asked about the color of the paint on railing, the pickets.

Mr. Yoon said the colors would be the exact same color the Board previously approved.

Ms. Sodt said they are using the same color palette that the Board approved last year.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the lower railing at the historic entrance would also be the same color.

Mr. Yoon confirmed that it would be the same color.

Ms. Strong asked if there was an original railing at that entrance.

Mr. Yoon said he didn't know; they looked but could not find photos.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board discussion:

Mr. Hannum said what is being replaced is not historic material and it is an improvement.

Mr. Veith said it doesn't clash with the building and it relates well.

Mr. Lee said it is an improvement.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations based on the following:

The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #113990 because the proposed alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/HM/TV 11:0:0 Motion carried.

031908.22

Smith Tower
506 Second Avenue

Applicant Comment:

Mike Almon presented for the ownership of Smith Tower and requested approval of two items. The first is removing and replace the existing scissor gate of seven of the eight elevators; seven are operable and one is not operable. He said he presented to the ARC the reasons behind the need to change all elevators. There are three primary areas they are trying to comply with: 1) safety issue, 2) Building Code Compliance, as there are hundred year old motors that need to be replaced and 3) general operating efficiency.

Mr. Almon said the second area is Floor 32. He said the message from the ARC was that they retain more historic elements; they were able to increase the level of historic elements that will be protected. He said they have outlined those in the packet. He

said there were specific questions about what the impacts of the elevators would be on the lobbies so they included pictures to show that there would be no change to the look and feel of the elevator. He said the scissor gate is only visible when the elevator door is closed and running up the building. He said there will be no change to the outward appearance of the elevator lobbies.

Mr. Yuan showed a photo of the elevator with the door open. He referred the Board to page six and said when the elevator cab is on the floor nothing looks different; when the cab arrives for a split second the scissor gate would open. He said once the scissor gate closes the elevator moves up and so the change out would have minimal visual effect when standing in the lobby. He said most of the time there is no elevator on the floor; when it comes the door is open.

Mr. Almon said three consultants have said the elevator mechanism is not historical that they were installed in the 1940s or 1950s because of the manner in which the gate opens and closes. Elevators they have worked on in the past and based on those mechanisms and based on the fact that it is a button that opens and closes it all tells them it wasn't installed in the 1960s or 1970s, but rather in the 1940s or 1950s. They were told stories of how when it was originally installed there was no gate and that a person actually stood with a stick and had everyone turn around, face the wall and step back and the stick was what kept people from touching the shaft and then they came up with the newly improved elevator closing gate mechanism. What they determined in the 1950s was that the mechanism opened and closed with a button, anything that gets in the way of the scissor gate gets crunched or the scissor gate breaks. It was a first generation scissor gate, which in this day we know has safety issues.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen said he recalled from the ARC meeting that the scissor gates are not historic.

Mr. Almon said three consultants, Lerch Bates, Thyssen, and Otis, all of whom said the scissor gates are not original. They don't have photos of original condition, but this is what they have been told.

Mr. Abelsen said on page five there is a diagram showing all the elevators noting that each is to be modified. He said that his understanding that the modification is primarily the gates but asked if any working mechanisms need modification.

Mr. Almon said with the mechanical upgrades there are some buttons that need to be changed; they aren't there yet but they will come back to present those to the board when they get them. But all other grill work and everything else stays the same.

Mr. Abelsen asked if they would upgrade the panel to fire department requirements.

Mr. Almon said they aren't sure what will be required. They want approval related to the scissor gates, which they know is out of compliance in several areas, they then

will submit plans for an elevator upgrade. They've already met with the fire code compliance people and were told that the scissor gates are a trouble point.

Ms. Tremaine asked if they would be saving removed materials.

Mr. Almon confirmed that all materials would be saved; he said every element from Smith Tower that is a historical element is being saved.

Mr. Veith stated for the record that early in the process they talked about the 10th floor having a lot of changes; those are completely off the table now as that floor is being left alone. He said the third change that was initially talked was the change to the 32nd floor. He stated that no changes are being done to the 10th floor.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee said this has been seen at ARC and feels that it is acceptable; that it is a life safety issue and these are not original materials.

Mr. Veith clarified that Mr. Lee was speaking of the elevators; he said he agreed and it seems like an essential change in terms of life-safety though he would prefer not to change but he understands they have to.

Ms. Howard said she appreciates the additional information about the aesthetic impact; it was very helpful.

Mr. Veith said they have seen several alternative or ways they could do this and from the alternatives that the ARC has seen, this seems to be the most acceptable. He said they have made some adjustments to minimize the visual impact and the Board has gotten about as much as it can get and still meet all the requirements that need to be met both for the Board and others.

Mr. Matthews said it is important that there is one original elevator left intact.

Ms. Strong asked if the intact elevator is operational.

Mr. Almon said no, it was infilled during a past large project. The elevator shaft was removed for bracing purposes.

Mr. Veith said with regard to the 32nd floor they talked about and think the owner has settled on a solution. He said his previous discomfort with this was that even when they presented to the full board it still wasn't clear what the solution was going to be. He said now the solution the owner has settled on seems to be enclosing a portion of the original into the new apartment. He said a part of that floor will be behind a door and the presently existing bathroom would also be enclosed within the new unit that is proposed. He said he has a lot of misgivings about losing those features, but thinks he has accepted that it is the way it needs to be in this particular case. He said he looked at the Standards that the Staff Report cites under no. 4 of the proposed motion. He said he has a hard time convincing himself that we meet those Standards because we are removing a bathroom, losing a third of the original lobby, we are maintaining the enclosure for the elevators and the floor will still be there although it

will be behind a closed door. He said he has misgivings. He said he is not sure how he can modify the language of no. 4 to include the concerns he has. He said under no. 4 of the Staff Report, Proposed Motion for approval two standards are cited: No. 1: *A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.* He said he thinks this is beyond minimal change but maybe within acceptable.

Mr. Lee asked why staff included no. 4.

Ms. Sodt said it was added because the building is going to given a new use, but that the Board can modify the motion in any way they wish.

Mr. Veith continue on the second part of no. 4: No. 2: *The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.* He said they've tried to avoid but they ended up removing quite a bit. He said they always try to refer to the standards, but usually the Board refers to No. 9 which is more focused on additions and exterior alterations. He said if these two things are include in the motion he will vote for it but he said we are really close to the line, maybe over it.

Mr. Matthews said he thinks the face that the floor is damaged in bathroom where in the lobby hallway it is in good shape it seems reasonable to make this choice.

Mr. Lee agreed and said that he didn't see why they have to quote the Standards at all, but if he did quote any it would be No. 1 where we are trying to encourage useful conservation where at least the space is being conserved in some way.

Mr. Hannum asked if there was any reason they could strike it out.

Ms. Sodt said the Board could strike it if they wish.

Mr. Lee said they could just not mention it..

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interior alterations for the Smith Tower 506 Second Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, the Board finds that the proposed alteration or significant change would not adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance No. 113427.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, the Board finds that the information submitted by the applicant demonstrates the reasonableness of the proposed alterations in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner:
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/MH/CH

11:0:0 Motion carried.

031908.23

Olympic Tower
217 Pine Street

Jeff Biles said it is a very limited design change to the existing face/lightbox is actually two pieces and opens up. It is all metal across the front with cut outs for the letters. They propose to remove the majority of the metal and then do reinforcing to accommodate the new plexi-glass so it is secure within the existing framework.

Board Questions:

Mr. Lee said he saw this at ARC who said it was fine.

Mr. Veith asked for clarification of the portion that attaches to the top.

Mr. Biles said he just received this from the sign company so he is limited in knowledge. He said he said to the left side in the circle it looks like they are showing how to sandwich the plexi in between up at the top. He said it looks a little more complicated than he thinks it is.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said it is a reasonable replacement.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage at 217 Pine Street.. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #113425 because the proposed alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property, as per Standard #9 of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RM/TV

11:0:0 Motion carried.

031908.24

Rainier Club
820 Fourth Avenue

Ms. Sodt introduced Ron Wright, who has provided additional information on construction details.

Mr. Wright said that as part of the development of the adjacent site next to the United Methodist Church development the primary loading entrance of the Rainier Club is being blocked for the duration of construction. This proposal is providing a secondary or alternate loading door for the various deliveries to the club. There is an alley between the church and the Rainier Club; they propose opening an existing

window opening and put a door there temporarily. They will remove the bottom portion of the window opening; the brick will be saved. They will put in temporary brick so they can have a square opening for the door. Once the process is complete with the construction of the adjacent development and this entrance is no longer required the opening will be put back to its existing condition. Currently the opening does not have a window in it; the window has been blocked off for many years; it has a solid panel with heavy stucco covering on it. There is a ventilator unit above the window that works for what used to be a bathroom in that area. Their scope of work at this point is to remove the bricks, temporarily install a door, use for approximately two years and then re-installed the bricks that are currently existing.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Questions:

Mr. Matthews said he still has no questions.

Mr. Abelsen said it is temporary installation and reinstallation will be using existing material so he thinks this is reasonable.

Mr. Lee said it is not the primary elevation of the building.

Mr. Veith said it is a secondary façade.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed temporary service entrance at the Rainier Club 820 Fourth Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 113459 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/MT/MH 11:0:0 Motion carried.

031908.25 Lincoln Reservoir/Cal Anderson Park
1000 E. Pine Street

Removal of three trees for Sound Transit project work

Summary of proposed changes: Proposed removal of three trees for Sound Transit project work

Ms. Chave said the ARC reviewed this project. She introduced Sound Transit representatives who will provide an overview of the project. She said she has a public comment letter from the Friends of Seattle Olmsted Parks that was submitted at the ARC meeting. She said that letter states that FSOP understands the situation

and although they are not happy that trees have to be removed, if it is required they have recommendations on treatment of remaining Scholar Tree, which is a significant feature on this site. She said the letter was written to Michelle Ginder of Sound Transit; she recommended Ms. Ginder respond to their concerns.

Sound Transit representatives were Ron English and Michelle Ginder; David Gray represented Seattle Parks and Recreation.

Ms. Ginder said the Capitol Hill light rail station construction and requires the removal three trees in Cal Anderson Park. She said the site is part of the University Link Light Rail Project which is the first extension of the initial segment which is under construction now. She said there is a station at Capitol Hill and one at the University of Washington. They propose to begin construction on the Capitol Hill station later this year; and University Link will be open for service in 2016. She showed a site plan of the Capital Hill station which is an underground station located east of Broadway under Nagle Place. There are three entrances: the north entrance at John and Broadway; the west entrance at west side of Broadway south of Howell, and the south entrance at the corner of Nagle and Denny.

Ms. Ginder provided a graphics and photos showing the south entrance and its proximity to Cal Anderson Park and pointed out the three trees: a Tree of Heaven and two Sycamore Maple trees. The graphic showed the outline of the underground station box which will necessitate excavating down about 65 feet from the surface. In order to construct the structure wall and also to build a construction fence around the site they have been working with the Parks Department and SDOT and come to the conclusion that substantial pruning of the root systems and branches of all three trees would be required. The three trees are right up at the edge of where the station excavation will take place.

Ms. Ginder said another tree, a Chinese Scholar tree is a heritage tree and is very important to the park and the community; Sound Transit's plan is to protect the tree in place during construction. The mitigation plan that has been developed with the Parks Department deals with all the trees: Sound Transit would replace the three trees with three new trees in similar locations to where they are now; she said they have received recommendations of tree species from the landscape architect who designed the park expansion several years ago. They plan to provide the Parks department with a mitigation payment of \$25,000.00 which would be used to plant three additional trees in response to the Mayor's two for one tree replacement policy. The new trees would be planted in Cal Anderson Park or nearby Volunteer Park and would be determined by the Parks Department. The remaining portion of the mitigation funds would be used by the Parks Department to implement other landscape improvements in Cal Anderson Park.

Ms. Ginder said the Chinese Scholar tree will be protected in place during construction; they will be hiring a certified arborist to monitor all construction activities around the tree to make sure the tree is not harmed. She said they will be adding to the contract specifications language addressing root protection measures for the Chinese Scholar tree, putting a construction fence around perimeter of tree, and monitoring irrigation to make sure tree receives water.

Ms. Ginder identified outreach measures they have done: in January they briefed the Friends of Olmsted about the project and from whom they have received recommendations which have been incorporated into mitigation plan; the 60% station design open house scheduled in two weeks on April 3; and a few months before the trees are removed (in 2010) notices will be hung on the trees informing the public of their removal and the mitigation plans.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum asked if the retaining wall that will be removed is historic.

Mr. Gray said he isn't sure but the plan is to put it back in and just move the trees further away.

Mr. Hannum asked if it was made from concrete.

Mr. Gray confirmed that it was.

Mr. Martinson asked why the station ended up there.

Mr. English said previous station design would have affected the entire western edge of the park so the station was moved further west to minimize impacts to the park. Unfortunately given the location of the trees whose branches also extend into the street right of way they concluded they couldn't save them. To move the station further west reduces the amount of redevelopment that would occur and would also affect the functional design of the entrances. He said it was a balancing act; they tried to minimize impacts to the park yet also be functional.

Ms. Chave asked that applicants if there originally was a design that was partially in the park.

Mr. English said yes but that generally the public reaction was that moving it further west was a net benefit because of the reduced impacts to the park in general.

Mr. Lee asked if they were extending Nagle Place to the north.

Mr. English confirmed that at this time Nagle goes only to Denney and they propose to extend it all the way through the site in order to create a redevelopment site. He said it may not be a public roadway or even a through-street.

Mr. Abelsen said that due to the adjacency of the trees and the box if the roots were more of an issue than the canopy.

Ms. Ginder said the roots are critical but the canopy line would impede access by crane; branches would need to be excessively cut back. According to the arborist, the roots and the canopy are equally critical.

Mr. Gray said they had Parks Department arborist and their Urban Forester look at this and given the amount of equipment in the area and the amount of pruning, the trees would not survive.

Mr. Abelsen referred to the letter from Friends of Olmsted that they recommended 3” in caliper or larger trees; he asked if they will be continuing discussions with Friends of Olmsted for possible increase in size on the replacement.

Mr. English said they are taking their guidance from the Parks Department but it is their understanding that three to four inches is the ideal size for transplanting trees; trees larger than that have a larger risk for not re-growing not to mention a greater degree of difficulty of transplanting to new location.

Mr. Gray said their original thinking was to put large trees back in there but it is a challenge to find the big trees and then to get them to survive. He said one inch caliper trees are not desired; a good three to four inch caliper tree that will thrive right away is.

Ms. Chave said at this point she did not put the replacement of the trees into the motion because the actual replacement is so far into the future the Certificate of Approval would have expired. Even though it will be acknowledged in the minutes that they will have figure out what trees should be replaced, today’s action is just approving the removal.

Mr. Martinson asked what the remaining lifespan of the existing trees is.

Mr. Gray said another 40 – 50 years but given their location adjacent to the roadway there is a potential for them to be compromised.

Mr. Matthews said the replacement trees might have a lifespan of a couple hundred years so in the long run it wouldn’t be so bad.

Public Comment:

Mr. Lee said he would like a clarification from Mr. English about Nagle perhaps not continuing to be a street.

Mr. English said the existing Nagle Street will remaining place; they have one proposal that might extend Nagle through the next block to the north. He said the question is whether this is built as a through street and whether it would be open to the public. He said right now it is a single large superblock; it is part of their proposal and the question will be address as part of the design.

Board discussion:

Ms. Chave said the applicants will be referencing their mitigation plan so the Board can also include their mitigation plan included in their application.

Mr. Veith said when you see how much the existing trees extend over the street it is very clear a lot will have to be removed and if not removed purposefully they would probably be removed accidentally. He said having had some experience with seeing what happens when large portions of trees are removed the remaining part, if it survives, begins to look bizarre. He said removing the trees is actually a better solution than trying to save them.

Ms. Tremaine asked if the Scholar tree is rare.

Mr. English said it is a heritage tree; it is the age and size.

Ms. Chave said the Scholar tree was acknowledged by the Friends of Olmsted as a significant tree and the Parks Department arborists also acknowledge that it is one of the significant trees on the site.

Mr. English said they believe they can work around it but there are some mitigation steps that they specifically want to take to protect it.

Mr. Matthews said it seems that Sound Transit is approaching this in a responsible way and consulting with Friends of Olmsted Park; he said “good for them”.

Ms. Conti asked if any language about replacing the trees needs to be included.

Mr. Chave said the Certificate of Approval will expire well before 2014 so the applicants will come back to the Board with replacement and by that time they will have firm plans. The Board can acknowledge that the Board anticipates replacement.

Mr. Lee said documents are being presented which show replacement trees.

Ms. Conti said it is more of a nod that there are going to be six trees in total and they could either go to this site or potentially other sites.

Ms. Ginder said that three would go right back to replace and the other three would go elsewhere in the park.

Mr. Lee said they are on the drawings and the drawings are part of the application and covers that.

Ms. Chave said the Certificate of Approval will expire and they will have to reapply. But the Board can acknowledge they anticipate the tree replacement.

Action:

“I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the removal of three trees (two Sycamore Maples and one Tree of Heaven) for the Sound Transit project work at Lincoln Reservoir/Cal Anderson Park at 1000 E. Pine Street, as per the applicant’s submittal. This approval includes the condition that an ISA Certified Arborist be on-site to supervise the removal of the three trees and ensure the protection of the remaining heritage Scholar tree (*Sophora japonica*). This action is based on the following:

The proposed change does adversely affect some features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #121042, (trees), however, these specific trees are not the defining elements of the site. The Scholar tree (*Sophora japonica*) is a significant feature of the site, and with its protection and retention the following *Guideline* of the *Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines* will be met:

Preserving important landscape features, including ongoing maintenance of historic plant material.

The other factors of SMC25.12.835 are not applicable”

MM/SC/VA/CH

11:0:0 Motion carried.

031908.3 NOMINATIONS

031908.31 Pike Street Apartments
1200 E. Pike Street

Brian Oseran with Investco Properties represented the owner. He said they chose to nominate in anticipation of submitting a MUP.

Susan Boyle with BOLA presented the nomination. She gave a history of the neighborhood. She said they think this is an interesting building type, a vernacular type as a hybrid that doesn't fall into easier well-known categories of architectural history. She said there have been books written about it, one in 1935 about hybrid buildings in a series published by Steven Paul where they cited buildings such as the Pontevecchio Bridge in Florence which is the bridge that has buildings on it as an example of a hybrid. They compared these buildings to the kind of hybrids one would think of in the plant world.

Ms. Boyle said the building located at the corner of 12th and Pike Street was initially built as an apartment building. The specific location was initially linked by north-south transportation systems which were established initially on Broadway and later on 12th, 15th and 19th. She said Pike Street was paved in 1907 and became a trolley line in 1912. The area was part of auto row but it had other building types on it.

Ms. Boyle showed contextual photos; the building was consistent with scale of other buildings though the massing is different with the gable roofs. She introduced Sonja Sokol-Furesz.

Ms. Furesz said the building was constructed in two stages; the two story wood apartment building was permitted in 1903. It is a simple Queen Anne style with a cross gabled roof form, gabled entry porches with column supports, and the corner tower element with conical roof. She said the brick clad portion of the building was constructed in 1911 and came about as a result of Pike Street being widened by ten feet which took place around 1910. Eight feet for Pike Street was taken from the north side of the street which affected the subject property and the original apartment appears to have been lifted. The commercial base constructed at the new property line and then the frame apartments set back on top of that commercial base. She presented a 1912 photo of the resulting structure.

Ms. Furesz said the 1903 permit was granted to a Frank Lindquist and records indicate that he owned the building but never lived there and that a real estate firm John Davis and Company was also involved. Mr. Lindquist may have also been the designer of the apartment portion of the building. He was listed as a plasterer in the Polk Directories. No other information has been discovered about any other designer or builder.

Mr. Furesz said by 1910 there was a new property owner, the Gittelsohn family who owned the property as an investment property and not as residence. They owned it into the 1930s. In 1930 Seattle real estate mogul Henry Broderick temporarily owned it and in 1944 it was sold to Emil Galpon. Galpon created an apartment at the far east commercial space and he lived there for the next 30 years. She said that apartment tenants over time were individuals living alone and there didn't appear to be any couples or families with children. The commercial tenants tended to be building materials suppliers, light industrial businesses and service businesses.

She said the building changed over times with major alterations between the 1937 tax record photo and then 1959 tax record photo. In 1937 the building was in fairly poor condition but it had most of its original features present. The original wood clabbered and wood shingled siding; tuscan columns for the porch piers and the triple columnettes for the balcony supports; double hung wood sash windows, turret with conical roof; and corbled chimneys. She said in the 1959 photo it is shown that many of those details are gone: the asphalt brick siding had been applied and as a result the original trim was removed; the porch piers and balcony columnettes were removed; the turret was removed and replaced with a flat roof; fire escapes were added and the store front transom windows were either covered or removed.

Ms. Furesz said today looking at the south and west facades additional changes are evident: the west, south, and east facades are currently clad with painted cedar siding with approximately 9" exposure. The wood windows have been replaced with anodized aluminum windows. She said the on south side which faces onto East Pike the balcony and porch railings have been changed. One of the newer fire escapes is visible. The east façade faces on to a neighboring parking lot and windows were added into the brick at the commercial level most likely when the apartment was created there in 1946. Since then it appears variously sized and different type windows have been inserted in those non-original openings.

Ms. Furesz showed a view of the west façade which is on 12th and said in the small square window opening venting has been inserted. She showed two detailed views of the SW corner tower and said the porch columns appear and 1949 photo shows them removed. She said part of the north façade shows the wood frame porches and stairs projecting; some are partially enclosed. She said the 1959 asphalt siding is still visible on the apartment stories while the commercial level is finished with the brick.

Ms. Furesz said the commercial store fronts have been changed over time; the southwest store front appears the newest, the two appear less modern, perhaps original and the 1946 altered store front which encompasses the entry door to the apartment. She showed a photo comparison of the 1937 tax photo and a current view. She said the original storefront transoms have been covered or removed; the denticulated cornice have been covered, altered or removed and the decorative scrolls between each storefront have been removed. She showed interior views of the western-most commercial spaces; they have been remodeled extensively to serve as restaurant/bar area and those two spaces were combined into one.

Ms. Furesz said they were able to tour one apartment at the west end in the two story apartment portion. She said it retains its wood flooring and original wood trim and some details while the kitchen, bathroom floors have been remodeled and some spaces have been reconfigured. She said that changes to the building include the roof

form with the removal of the conical roof at the tower, the cladding and trim, the loss of porch columns and balcony columnettes, the change of all the windows and some storefronts, the removal of storefront detail, obscuring or removal of storefront transom windows, installation of awnings, removal of corbled chimney caps and some interior alterations.

Ms. Boyle said when they started to look at the building they looked for other hybrid types for comparison. She said they do seem to be endemic and many of the old streetcar neighborhood commercial areas including these examples nearby as well as Capital Hill, U-District, as well as along Eastlake and in Wallingford. She said this building raises significant questions about whether there is sufficient integrity to meet threshold standards; it is clearly old enough to meet those built with the original piece in 1903 and the second piece in 1909. She said with the removal of significant elements, the massing such as the turret and recladding, the window changes and the balcony railing changes and the revisions that have happened continuously over time the building doesn't carry the legibility of the era. She said a vernacular hybrid structure can be legitimately a landmark and can represent history but this building has been so fragmented that it is not so much a hybrid as it is a collage.

Ms. Boyle said the two sections don't legibly recall their original periods of constructions. She said in their view the building does not meet Criteria A or B because there is no association with an event or person and because the original architect isn't known they don't believe that it meets Criterion E. She said she thinks that its association with the development of Seattle's Pike/Pine corridor is more typical or general rather than significant. It is not associated with auto row and there is no record of any of those uses being in commercial spaces. She said in looking at Criterion D it goes back to two questions: does the building have sufficient integrity and does it retain visible characteristics of an architectural style or period and she said no to both. Regarding Criterion F she said it was identified in the 1975 survey by Steinbrueck and Nyberg as having community significance but not as a potential landmark. She said the building is not in the historic site; it either hasn't been looked at or was not included for other reasons.

Ms. Boyle said they think it has some visibility but that is because it is on a corner but that is the case with many corner buildings and because of its unusual form and massing. She said the awkwardness of the two joined pieces and the lack of clarity that is provided by so many of the contemporary elements almost renders this building similar to awkwardly designed townhouses of the current period. She said in her view this building does not meet the criteria in terms of the standard or designation criteria to be a Seattle landmark.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen said the gabled ends of the dormers appear to have been filled in and altered.

Ms. Furesz said they were shingled but she is not sure they were every lit.

Mr. Abelsen asked if they were at the same plane they were originally.

Ms. Furesz said she thought it was the roofing or the layers of cladding.

Ms. Chave said it probably was the layer because there was the fake brick and then the siding on top of that.

Mr. Abelsen said going back to Ms. Boyle's comment that the buildings was a sort of collage hybrid, he asked if she was able to determine the various changes from a chronological viewpoint.

Ms. Boyle said there were few permit records given the changes visible in the historic photographs; she said she can't find the chronology; the changes appear to have been expeditious repair types of changes over time.

Ms. Tremaine asked if they were able to get underneath the asbestos to see if the original clapboard was still there.

Ms. Boyle said it is actually not asbestos, it is a painted cedar siding with a large 9" exposure.

Ms. Furesz said they didn't pull back any siding. On the north rear siding the cedar siding is not in place it is still the 1950s asphalt fake brick. She said the near stairs that go down from the north side between this building and the property to the north there is an area that hasn't been reclad with the later siding. She said it looked like it could have been part of the original wood siding and was quite deteriorated.

Public Comment:

Liz Dunn, Pike Pine Urban Neighborhood Council said the neighborhood just found out about the landmark consideration today. She is hoping that the process can give them time to evaluate and respond. She said to her knowledge this is possibly the oldest building in the triangle of Pike-Pine that is east of Broadway that dates from the turn of the century. She said she owns the property that is kitty-corner to the building. She said that when Pike Street was widened, what she was told by her engineers is that it was also razed so that almost all of the Victorian building stock was demolished and a new generation of buildings was built in the late nineteen "teens" and early twenties that were more masonry "auto row" style. She said it is quite unique from their perspective; a building of that age is so rare. She said the only other building that may be as old is one about two blocks up that may also be that old.

Mike Malone said he was involved in historic preservation and has several nationally designated properties. He said he owns several properties in this neighborhood and spent a couple years working with the previous owner trying to purchase the property with the idea of restoration as opposed to demolition and building of more condos. He said he has many photos that show the building in better light than has been shown and said this building is a classic diamond in the rough. He said they had engineers and environmental people go through the building. He said the original beams and so much of the original building is still there. He said the significance of this building is that it was built at the turn of the century; the original paperwork at the City is dated 1898 and it was a Victorian Townhouse that turned into a mixed use building in 1910. It was a transition period between the finer homes on First Hill and Capitol Hill and the commercial zone at Pike-Pine. He said it is very significant and as Ms. Dunn mentioned there were multiple houses like this in the Pike-Pine corridor

that were razed. He said he has looked at this house since college and he has always watched the turret that was removed. He said everything is intact; the tower structure is there to take the turret again. He said the changes are not significant and reiterated that he had a construction company go through it. He said while the balustrades have been removed and the porch supports have been removed but the building can be easily restored. He said the wood windows were replaced with aluminum and this is not significant; rebuilding the turret is not a significant expense. He said the bones of the building are there and he said if the Board can't reach out and see a property like this and help this community save properties and allow people to come in and restore them, then other than trees and parks what are we doing here. He said this is a significant building.

Mr. Malone said he is concerned about due process; there are a lot of people in the community who are concerned about Pike-Pine and the re-zoning and the amount of development going on. He said they are trying to save their brick buildings and buildings that would never be seen here for designation. He said the driving force here is an 11,000 square foot lot; he said it is attractive to Mr. Oseran and his people. He said he appreciates that but said that he hopes the Board will take time to reflect on this before it is rejected because it is a truly wonderful turn of the century building in Seattle.

Ms. Chave said if the Board wants to defer nomination it would be appropriate. She said is true the community just recently found out about this and it is a very active community council. She said the Board does have the option of deferring and going to see the building in person.

Mr. Veith said he is leaning toward not nominating it but he said he is quite willing to defer if there are other board members who feel that way.

Mr. Lee said until Mr. Malone so eloquently supported the building he was leaning against nomination.

Ms. Tremaine said she was going to approve the nomination.

Mr. Lee said the local community needs to have a say in this rather than just the four hours notice. He said he strongly recommends the Board defer. He said if the Board votes against nomination it is gone.

Ms. Chave said the Board can also approve the nomination if you want the chance and then the designation meeting is set for early May.

Mr. Lee called for an informal poll of nominating the building; there were five members in favor of nomination.

Ms. Chave said there has to be at least six members in favor to nominate.

Mr. Lee recommended deferring and asked if there was a motion.

Mr. Veith moved to defer consideration of 1200 East Pike Street for nomination as a landmark.

Ms. Chave said the next meeting is April 2.

Mr. Lee asked Ms. Chave if there was available space on the agenda.

Ms. Chave said yes.

Mr. Lee asked if the deferral would be acceptable to the applicant.

Mr. Oseran said yes.

Action:

“I move to defer consideration of the nomination of the property at 1200 East Pike Street until April 2, 2008”

MM/SC/TV/CH 11:0:0 Motion carried.

There was discussion among the Board about a tour of the building. Ms. Chave said if Board members want a tour the applicants would be able to provide it.

Mr. Lee said that those wanting an organized tour should email Ms. Chave.

031908.32

Central Building
810 Third Avenue

Kate Krafft presented the nomination of the Central Building on behalf of the City. She said the building is located on an entire half block on the westward sloping east side 3rd Avenue between Columbia and Marion Streets. She said it is an eight story commercial building which was constructed in 1906-07. When it was initially designed it was intended to be a twenty story building with a massive stepped back central clock tower. The façade composition is two part vertical block with a very distinct base, a vertical shaft and then a minor cap with distinctive cornice.

Ms. Krafft said it incorporates fine Beaux Arts design architectural detailing that is indicative of the original design and intent. She said the Central Building is directly associated with the initial period of downtown commercial expansion that occurred between 1902 and 1920 as a result of local economic prosperity after the Klondike Gold Rush and in tandem with the explosive population growth and suburban neighborhood development. She said during this era modern downtown urban scale began with the construction of the earliest steel frame high rise buildings and the establishment of a concentration of banking establishments and department on 2nd Avenue from Cherry to Pike Street.

Ms. Krafft showed photos to illustrate the context of the urban geography of the area. She showed a view looking up Columbia Street to 6th Avenue to where the Rainier Hotel would be, Providence Hospital and Central School off of 6th and 7th. Showing a photo from circa 1892 she said historically the commercial activity was concentrated along 1st and 2nd and in close proximity to Yesler; this was post-fire so there are brick masonry buildings along 1st Avenue. There were remnants of the residential district that spread all the way north but by this time there was the development of First Hill and burgeoning communities throughout the City. She said 3rd Avenue was historically dominated by a number of churches; she showed a view

from Denney Hill from around 1895 and said there were at least five major churches along 3rd Avenue among them, Plymouth Congregational up toward Seneca and Spring. 3rd Avenue was still dominated by residences and small commercial buildings. She said there were three churches just to the north of the site where the Central Building would be built, one on the site and two to the north. She showed a photo between Madison and Marion and said there were two churches on the block on the east side and then the Methodist Church at the corner of Marion and 3rd Avenue at the site of the Central Building.

Ms. Krafft said the other factors when looking at commercial development are the regrades; she showed images of the regrade of 3rd Avenue. The regrades were done to make it more level and attractive to commercial development. She said the earliest steel frame and ferral concrete office buildings were constructed because of the favorable investment conditions after the turn of the century two of which are the Alaska Building at 2nd and Cherry and the American Savings Bank Empire Building at 2nd and Marion. She said despite the construction of these buildings there was still a problem at the turn of the century that there weren't enough suitable good office buildings. She said the PI published a lengthy article lamenting the problem in 1906. She said there was a difficulty of assembling a block or half block of property because the parcels were broken up into so many ownership interests. In October of 1906 the PI announced that the Trustee Company would be constructing a new building on an entire half block including the old Methodist Church; they would build this monumental commercial building at this central point, thus the Central Building. It was intended to be 18 stories tall with a central tower and would have all the latest and most modern mechanical, electrical and telephone equipment.

Ms. Krafft said the building was designed by Charles R. Aldrich who was an engineer and architect, educated in Minneapolis and then settled in Seattle. He was an employee of the Trustee Company and was their Superintendent Architect for a number of projects. She said as designed the building would include 750 offices and nine retail spaces at street level. She said there were lots of advertisements for the building but early on and in the advertisements they acknowledged that at present time only eight stories would be constructed and that other stories would be added as soon as possible thereafter which were never added.

Ms. Krafft said this approach to partial construction was not unusual. The American Savings Bank had been constructed in two phases fairly rapidly and the planned 12 story Melborne Building was being constructed in a phased manner as well. What they were able to fund included 350 offices which was the largest office building yet constructed. She said the Trustee Company used a method of funding called unit ownership; they advertised a great deal as they continued to find investors. The Trustee Company was founded by two individuals who found wealth in the Klondike era in the Yukon River trade; they were both prominent business men and involved in many public affairs. She said they established the Trustee Company in 1903. The Central Building was the sixth building constructed by the Trustee Company.

Ms. Krafft showed a photo of the building taken shortly after construction; she pointed out the open recess with stairs leading down to retail shops at the basement level and another recessed entry at the center of the building. There is an observation deck which was run by the Seattle Chamber of Commerce who occupied the entire 8th floor level. She said the offices were occupied by many government

representatives and there were also libraries and a number of civic organizations housed in the building. She said the corridor system and system of interconnected “office rooms” so that a business could occupy a group of interconnected rooms of varying sizes which provided flexibility. She said the press at the time wrote a lot about “office rooms”; this was the latest in efficient office design.

Ms. Krafft cited a brochure sometime after 1903 in which the Trustee Company was promoting a building on 3rd and Main and were looking for investors. Because of its proximity between the commercial district, the central waterfront and the rail lines they also developed the Exchange Building which is now thought of as the Toshiro Kaplan Building. She believes they also developed buildings in Spokane, Portland and possibly Los Angeles.

Ms. Krafft said the architect Charles Aldrich was from Michigan and educated at the University of Minnesota. By 1888 he had been appointed an instructor at the University of Minnesota where he continued to teach for fifteen years. He taught manual training courses that included mechanical drawing and also had his own practice during this time. He designed the Armory Building at the University of Minnesota campus in 1895-96 and Jones Hall, the Physics Building in 1901; he also designed the Pillsbury Branch Library in Minnesota.

Ms. Krafft said Aldrich worked for the Trustee Company until 1911; after that he was in a partnership and became superintendent for the construction for the County-City Building, the King County Courthouse and later worked on the King County Fairgrounds. Aldrich died in 1939.

Ms. Krafft said the Central Building is also important in relationship to civic center planning. She said after the turn of the century with all the commercial development there was a great push to prepare a plan that would guide the future development of downtown Seattle. The Washington State AIA began to lobby for it in 1908; she presented a plan by A. Warren Gould to create a civic center with connections between the then King County Courthouse on 7th. In 1920 the City established the Municipal Plans Commission and ultimately hired Virgil Boag to prepare the plan of Seattle, known as the Boag Plan. She said in the process of developing the plan, Boag and the Municipal Plans Commission were lobbied by local architects, property owners and entrepreneurs who sought to influence the Commission and their decisions. Among those who sought to influence them were Arthur Howley and W. D. Wood, the owners of the Central Building.

She said in 1910 they made public a plan for a new civic center which involved a tiered ten acre site at the center of downtown. Along the base of First Hill between 3rd and 7th Avenues; and bounded by Columbia and Spring Streets. She said the plan was based a round a formal Beaux Arts inspired civic center with a symmetrical plan around a central mall and incorporating two existing buildings: the Central Building and the Seattle Public Library constructed in 1903. She said the plan would involve constructing a new City Hall and County Building and several other civic buildings around the mall. One of the most innovated aspects of the plan was they proposed to construct a series of underground subways and elevators to connect buildings on 1st through 6th Avenues. She said both Mr. Howley and Mr. Wood had been involved in transportation, particularly railway, issues; apparently Mr. Howley traveled a great deal to collect information and to promote this concept. This concept did not

advance beyond discussion and presentation. She said the ultimate Boag plan that was adopted that proposed the civic center and the Denny regrade area did not proceed either.

Ms. Krafft provided photos of historic views of the building as it evolved. She pointed out the notches where one could enter the basement level shops; the observation deck, the storefronts, mezzanine level, transom windows and the 2nd floor. A view from the Smith Tower around 1914 showed the Central Building, the Rainier Club, the new Methodist Church constructed after the old one was removed; the Library, and the development of the University tract and a sense of the expansion of the commercial activity and the development of downtown and expansion of residential neighborhoods. She said the tax record from 1937 shows that the corner areas have been enclosed and changes at the storefront level; the upper levels remained unaltered. A view from 1945 shows the historic storefront configuration. The cartouche that included the Central Building logo was removed or came down after the 1949 earthquake. She provided photos of other Beaux Arts inspired buildings including the City County Building, the King County Courthouse as well as the Post Office which was constructed in 1903 and the Library constructed in 1902-1903 both of which were demolished in the 1960s.

Ms. Krafft presented photos showing the terracotta cladding which was grey speckled and custom made to replicate stone and the distinct base with intermediate cornices and series of plaques and cartouches around the base. She said the main entry on the north side and consists of an entry vestibule that is still intact with marble cladding and entry into retail spaces off of recess. She said the principal façade is oriented to 3rd Avenue with storefronts along the base, mezzanine level windows, intermediate band and shaft, recess at the central bay with the balustrade. The modern storefronts were updated and installed within the last ten years with the steel canopies that were design such that you see through them and they don't obscure the monumental granite columns and the detailing is visible from the street.

She showed photos of the side bay with some detail of its frieze visible and classical details at the window heads and jambs as well as the lion's heads, the smooth terracotta cladding and smooth dentil course with elaborate cornice and the observation deck; she presented closer views of the cartouches and plaques. All the storefront bays have been modernized but the window configuration is very similar to original as are the window configurations throughout the remainder of the base and the shaft. Storefronts on the south elevation appear to have been installed early on. The rear elevation at the alley side is relatively unaltered; it has slightly different window and fenestration treatment. The interior lobby was originally entered through what an exterior recess; the assemblage of historic building fabric includes the marble floors, the marble cladded walls, the wood trimmed transom windows, the mezzanine windows, doors, the elaborate ceiling treatment. She said the light fixtures are either original or replications, but they look like they belong there.

Ms. Krafft provided photos of the lobby showing the ceiling cove with all the elaborate molding and pilasters and column caps. She said it is symmetrical in plan; showing a view to the north with marble stairs with curved balustrades and marble stairs ascending to the next floor. The view toward the south again shows the stairs and the marble treatment. A closer view of the stairs was shown showing the meander pattern that is throughout a good part of the lobby.

Ms. Krafft said the Central Building is a particularly important and illustrative example of an office building dating from a pivotal period in downtown commercial real estate development. She said the building exhibits a distinct architectural character, it is a notable example of Beaux Arts inspired design and is directly associated with early civic center planning efforts. Although the store front level has been altered and modernized to some degree, the majority of the exterior is well-preserved and a significant portion of the original elegant entrance lobby has been preserved. The Central Building appears to meet several of the standards for designation.

It is associated in a significant way with a significant aspect of the cultural, political, or economic heritage of the City. It embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, or period. Because of its prominence and spatial location, contrasts of site, age scale, it is an easily identifiable visible feature in its neighborhood and contributes to the distinctive quality and identity of the downtown commercial district.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum asked why the additional stories were not constructed.

Ms. Krafft said there apparently was not the demand for office space; she said she is sure it was an economic reason but she can't find anything to substantiate that.

Mr. Martinson asked about the store fronts.

Ms. Krafft said the structural plans were really detailed but she said the architect likely worked for the development company and she thinks some design change decisions were made there on the site. She said the exterior elevations do not show storefronts on the south side; they are all along the front and there are retail spaces at the basement level.

Mr. Abelsen asked how the cornice that caps the building plays into the original design of the building given the building was designed to add more floors.

Ms. Krafft said it is detailed in the original drawings; the architectural drawings are for the eight story building, they are not for the 20-story building. They developed the rendering to promote it but by the time they went to build they made it clear they would build it in phases. She said the cornice was expected to be of a temporary nature but it is shown in the architectural drawings.

Ms. Strong asked if the armor plated vault is still in existence.

Ms. Krafft said she didn't know. She said apparently it was quite a big deal to have that there.

Representative for the owners, Joe Munioz, LaSalle Investment Management said they own other buildings in downtown Seattle including the Dexter Horton Building. He introduced Tammy Ginzale and E. J. Maloney with Pinnacle who are the property managers and Jessica Clawson with McCullough Hill. He said based on what he has

read, it has not been terribly explicit that the nominated features would include just the exterior and the nominate portions of the lobby. He said Ms. Sodt did a great job in making that clear in the Staff Report. He said their ownership plans for the building include no major alterations to the exterior or the lobby; based on this nomination they have no issue with it. They agree that the building has historical significance on many levels and are in agreement.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said yes, it should be nominated for a number of reasons: the architecture itself and its presence on the street are two significant aspects of it. He said it is nicely done and does represent the Beaux Arts style. He said it is definitely worthy of nomination.

Mr. Veith said it is a very elegant building true to the meaning of the word. It is a tightly controlled design, the detailing is sharp and the way the building has been modified has accentuated that historical character; he said it should be nominated and he looks forward to seeing the presentation at the next meeting. He said he would be interested in knowing some characterization of how the original design of the storefronts because with these downtown buildings the occupation of the storefronts changes and the Board often see Certificate of Approval applications to modify the storefronts to accommodate new uses. The Board prefers to look at a system that is continually adjustable but that is still compatible to the original system. He said that any information that could be added to the file that deals with that issue would be very helpful to future Boards and future Board consideration. He said it doesn't need to be a long presentation, it could just be a couple of photographs and a description.

Ms. Strong said she supports nomination as written in the staff report based on Criteria C, D, and F. She said she had the opportunity to go to the building; she asked the representatives for the building if they owned the building during the renovation (Mr. Munioz said no). Ms. Strong said it is beautifully done and it really gives one a sense of what that building was like originally.

Ms. Tremaine said she supports nomination based on staff recommendation of Criteria C, D, and F. She said it is the earliest tall steel framed building in the beautiful Beaux Arts style; she said she likes the speckled glazed terracotta and the marble lobby is lovely.

Ms. Nicolas said she also supports the nomination based on the staff report.

Ms. Conti said she supports the nomination also based on the staff report. She said she loves the Beaux Arts style and with the finishes and the custom terracotta.

Mr. Martinson said he supports the nomination based on the staff report.

Ms. Howard said she supports the nomination based on the staff report.

Mr. Matthews said he agrees totally and what he learned from Ms. Krafft's presentation about its place in a civic plan which makes a very argument for Criterion C, but it meets the other Criteria as well.

Mr. Hannum said he supports the nomination and that it meets the Criteria recommended by staff including the interior of the lobby.

Mr. Lee said he supports the nomination mainly based on Criterion D. He said it is a very elegant building and he wants to take another look at the lobby.

Ms. Krafft said the civic plan was a surprise when they were doing the research. They saw references to it and had to dig quite a bit because it is somewhat obscure; nothing went forward but it was very interesting idea.

Mr. Lee said it was interesting and shows how arbitrary and how accidentally the City developed.

Action: I move approval of the Central Building at 810 Third 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 interior main lobby including the following features: the Alaska marble wall and pillar cladding, the coffered ceilings, the marble flooring and green marble panels at the elevator bays, and the open flared marble-clad stairwells with marble banisters and newel posts located to each side of the lobby space, but excluding the modern alcove at the east end of the lobby; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for May 7, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MC/CH

11:00 Motion carried.

031908.4

CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES

031908.41

Norton Building
800 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt presented the relevant information and said the agreement was pretty standard and pointed out that the property owner asked for some specific language to be inserted to exclude review for the tiled decking on the plaza that is to the south and west of the tower base, and also planters that have been obscured by public view because of the bank addition because they were having water penetration issues on portions of the site, both of which are not viewed by public.

Mr. Lee said it seems reasonable to him.

Mr. Veith asked if there are any reviews with the Landmarks Board required or are all possible changes under administrative review.

Ms. Sodt said a Certificate of Approval is required for any changes to the exterior of the building excluding items under A2; she said administrative review is available for things like mechanical equipment.

MM/SC/TV/VA 11:0:0

031908.42 Eitel Building
1507 Second Avenue
Request for an extension

Ms. Sodt said the owners have asked for another 60 day extension as they are still working on their EIS.

I move the board accept a sixty day delay for Controls and Incentives for the Eitel Building.

MM/SC/VA/MS 11:0:0

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator