



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 256/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, May 7, 2008– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Alyce Conti

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

050708.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of March 19, 2008

MM/SC/HM/MH 10:0:0 Approved as amended.

Meeting of April 2, 2008 Minutes not available.

050708.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

Mr. Finrow arrived at 3:36 PM.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

050708.21 Arctic Building
700 Third Avenue

Application comment: Hank Weaver, Weaver Architects, said the proposed exterior alterations include storefront changes on 3rd Avenue and around the corner on Cherry Street, including new canopies and flags. The proposed flag locations were identified as being historic accurate through a photograph; they have tried to locate the flags in the exact location as shown in the photo but are worried about too much terracotta damage so shifted the flag location slightly. On the 3rd Avenue side, the storefronts north of the main entry are not part of this review and will be brought before the Board at a later date. The new entry to the restaurant, “Juneau”, new mullions and glazing for energy efficiency, new main entry doors are included in this application.

Mr. Weaver said the base of the store fronts will have granite which will match the column bases around the building. The wood door for Juneau will be stained dark brown; the color for the mullions, spandrels and frames will be dark brown so they will “disappear”. The awnings are proposed to be blue (a sample was provided to Board).

Ms. Sodt reported that ARC has reviewed the application twice.

Mr. Lee asked if there were any changes since ARC reviewed.

Mr. Weaver said the spandrel panel above the storefronts, which is listed on the drawing as metal has been changed to stucco/plaster.

Mr. Veith asked if that change is included in the set of plans distributed to the Board.

Ms. Sodt advised the applicant submit drawings that include that revision.

Mr. Veith asked if the change would be at every bay or just at the entry bay.

Mr. Weaver said it would be at every bay that has an awning.

Mr. Veith asked if the drawing previously said remain as existing and now it is being changed to stucco.

Mr. Weaver said it was going to remain and be painted but they will use stucco/plaster instead. He said it will be for the tenants north of the entry in thinking of future signage that may be going into the panel. The panel that is

there now is old and worn; plaster will be easier to deal with. It will be painted brown to match as before.

Mr. Lee asked the age of the existing panel that is being removed.

Mr. Weaver said it dates to the 1950s or 1960s and is not historic; all the storefronts at base level are all aluminum systems dating from the 1960s-1970s.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the section cut on the 3rd Avenue elevation indicates a faux drapery of some sort and asked for clarification.

Mr. Weaver said it is a curtain that hangs off the canopy; the City won't allow them to put it over the sidewalk so they will pull it back into the opening. It is just a drape to give the canopy a little more presence.

Rob Brewster, Arctic Hotel, said it is an alcove that is recessed back. There are no windows; it is just in line with the side of the building.

Mr. Veith asked if there was glass on either side of the door.

Willard Park said there is; the drapes cover the return wall not the glass and they are just to dress up the return.

Mr. Hannum asked what the ARC discussion entailed.

Mr. Lee said that the curtain and the change to stucco had not been seen at ARC.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said he didn't understand the draperies, why they are there.

Mr. Brewster said the old clubs often had an awning that had a curtain that came down the side but the City won't allow that to protrude, which is where it normally would have been; this is why they pulled it back to sit within the property line. In theory it retains the look the building would have had a long time ago.

Mr. Lee informed the Board that ARC thought the application was not problematic; the changes don't affect the fabric of the building and asked the Board if there were any concerns. There was general agreement that the changes seemed reasonable.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 116969 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/MH/CH

11:0:0 Motion approved.

Ms. Sodt reminded the applicant to provide the updated drawings to her as soon as possible.

050708.22

Magnolia Library

2801 34th Ave W

Proposed exterior sign

Ms. Chave said this application has been reviewed by ARC a couple times and at the last ARC meeting the ARC saw the final design. She said the applicant has added an address sign to the application.

David Strauss said the application as submitted is for a double-sided lighted building sign to read, "Seattle Public Library Magnolia Branch". They propose to site it on the SE corner of the site at 34th W and West Armour Street. He provided a photo of the proposed sign which will be constructed of corten steel with laser cut letters out of that with an acrylic backing behind that to diffuse the light; it will be lit by a single fluorescent light inside the light.

Mr. Strauss proposed a second sign, which has not been discussed with ARC, is an address sign to go on 34th Avenue. He showed the Board the proposed locations of both signs. The address sign is unlighted, laser-cut corten steel letters; it is about 5' long and is one foot off the ground. Mr. Strauss provided a section drawing.

Ms. Strong asked the color of the address letters.

Mr. Strauss responded they would be in rusted metal; they would be the corten steel as opposed to the lighted sign which would be reversed.

Ms. Chave asked if this was a requirement for the Fire Department.

Mr. Strauss said the address sign is not a requirement; the Library asked for it about a month ago and the sign needs to be separate from the main sign.

Mr. Veith asked if the sign would sit on unpaved ground.

Mr. Strauss affirmed it would and would sit in front of a rockery; there is about a foot and a half of planted area.

Ms. Chave asked for the applicant to provide revised site plans to show the location.

Mr. Strauss agreed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee thought the proposed signage an elegant solution.

Mr. Veith had no issues and said the Board has worked a lot with Mr. Strauss and said his drawings are accurate.

Mr. Lee advised that the motion would need to be amended to make it clear it includes both signs.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage, both the name sign and the address sign, as per the submittal with the understanding that a revised site plan will be submitted to the staff. This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #121100 as the proposed signage does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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*.

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

MM/SC/VA/MS

11:0:0 Motion approved.

050708.23

Rosen House

9017 Loyal Avenue NW

Proposed exterior paint colors

Ms. Chave explained the project which was to approve paint colors for a landmark house in the Loyal Heights neighborhood. She provided a photo of when the house was designated for review and said the paint color is a blue-gray. She said there are new owners who want to repaint and have submitted colors for approval. Ms. Chave presented the colors for the window frames, the trim, and the house.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the Controls and Incentives on the building.

Ms. Chave said the Controls are on the exterior, the site, with some exclusions on the site and the some interior features. She said the interior has equal significance to the exterior and is very unique. She said there isn't any documentation on what the original paint color was for the house; it could have been a stained shingle. She said the Board is to determine whether the colors sympathetic to the building; and act on the applicant's presentation whether or not it is appropriate. She said that paint is something that can be changed in the future.

Ms. Strong asked if the fence would also be painted because it matches the house. She said the fence is the front NE of the property; they have also installed a gate so you can't pull in anymore.

Mr. Hannum's concern was there is no contrast with the trim.

Mr. Lee said it is just a layer of paint on a private house.

Mr. Abelsen said if this building wasn't already painted there would be more concern.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior paint colors, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 121215 as the proposed exterior paint colors do 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*.

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

MM/SC/MS/RM

11:0:0 Motion approved.

050708.24 Dearborn House
1117 Minor Avenue
Proposed security gate

Ms. Chave introduced the applicant, Kji Kelly from Historic Seattle and said the application is for a small change to the Dearborn House; the ARC reviewed this last Friday. ARC recommended changes in the swing and that was submitted right after the meeting; she provided the drawing to the Board for review.

Mr. Kelly said the proposed gate is an out-swing gate on non-street facing west elevation of the Dearborn House. It is at the top of the stairwell that leads down into the ground floor. They have had problems with people sleeping in the stairwell and engaging in illegal activities; last month a rock was thrown in, breaking the window, in attempt to break in. The gate is a solution to secure the building. The gate will be steel and will match the same profile and finish and proportions of existing railing that was installed in 2003 as part of accessibility project.

Ms. Chave stated the gate will be on the back side of the building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee thought it was a minimal change.

Ms. Howard said it is something they need to do.

Mr. Matthews thought it the right thing to do.

Mr. Veith said it is a good idea and the right design.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed security gate on the west elevation, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report as the proposed security gate does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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*.

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

050708.25 Doyle Building
119 Pine Street

Applicant comment: James Adams explained that the application is for new business signage, with the intent that the signage would do no damage to the building. They plan to install continuous metal panels for signage that would fit inside the window mullion opening, down below the terracotta work. The lighting would be ½” push through acrylic letters in a bronze aluminum box that will be lit from inside. There is a sign box that sits behind the glass so all the wiring and the electrical happens inside the building. Where they do not have an illuminated sign they will continue to have the metal sign band continue across at the same depth. The non-illuminated metal is attached to the glass via commercial bond tape. Where there is flex in it, they will use two brackets that will connect to the mortar joints in the terracotta. It is a small 2” custom bent bracket. The bracket will come up and tuck in underneath the terracotta tile at the top; it will be secured with an anchor into the grout joint and then capped and painted out to match the terracotta.

Mr. Adams said they also propose two blade signs; one facing the corner perpendicular to Pine and one perpendicular to 2nd Avenue. The bracket is being provided and the tenant will put in the blade sign; this will be the standard for all tenants within the space. There is a plate at the top and at the bottom; he provided a detail which shows how the anchoring goes into the mortar joints and not into the terra cotta. There will be two plaques, one on either side of the doors; the existing entrance has plaques, the entrance being discussed had plaques at one time. The plaques are relief bronze and will read: BECU Financial Center. Attachment will be into the mortar joint and not the terra cotta. There is a 24-hour ATM sign that will go inside behind the glass in the storefront because the vestibule ATM is a 24-hour access ATM.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked about the material for the two poles that sign hang from on the ATM sign.

Mr. Adams said it would be a dark bronze to match.

Mr. Matthews asked if the rosettes would be painted the same color as the terracotta.

Mr. Adams said the rosettes are bronze to match everything else; on the blade signs they match the signage component. The straps they are using on the window box signs will be painted out to match the terracotta to “disappear”.

Ms. Tremaine asked if they would be saving the brass Doyle Building sign.

Mr. Adams said they will not be removing the existing Doyle signs; they don't know where the other two are, only have remnants of where a sign was at one time.

Ms. Sodt said only recently was the storefront taken back to its original configuration. She provided a photo that shows a plate glass window where now there is an approved entry. Ms. Sodt said she suspects that the plaques have been gone for a while.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum thought it was elegant.

Mr. Lee said it was fantastic.

Ms. Howard thought it was a great solution.

Mr. Lee said it was nice work.

Mr. Veith appreciated the thorough set of drawings, photographs and details.

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

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #113987 because the proposed alterations do 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/CH 11:0:0 Motion approved.

050708.26 Fauntleroy Church, UCC/YMCA
9260 California Ave SW
Proposed window replacement

Ms. Chave said ARC has reviewed the project a couple times. She said the church is a mid-century modern design; it was designated a City landmark in

the 1980s. She said one of the most significant features is the sanctuary window on the inside; it covers the whole wall at the back of the sanctuary. She said the applicants said the window has failed; the applicants have been looking at alternatives for replacement for over a year. She said they came to ARC asking if they could replace the window with a steel frame system but really preferred an aluminum frame system. She said that the ARC thought aluminum system was appropriate but asked for additional drawings that showed the aluminum system which the applicant provided.

Mr. Lee said one thing about the steel system is it has round corners which didn't match the existing wood profile; the aluminum sections are bigger than steel sections but they have a square edge. He said aesthetically it looks better with the square edge than the steel does with rounded corner although it is a slightly bigger profile so ARC thought it was fine.

Ms. Chave said the applicant provided information about the structural stability of their existing system which they are not comfortable with performance-wise from an earthquake standpoint. She said there are still the same number of units and panes, it is just the glazed part is a little smaller because the aluminum members are a bit larger than the wood or steel would be.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the wood is stained or painted.

Ms. Chave said it was painted and the applicant plans to paint the new to match existing. Their intent is to get as close as possible to what is there now.

Mr. Martinson clarified the members were just slightly bigger.

Mr. Lee said it would be hard to tell the difference from inside because of the silhouette from outside trees.

Mr. Abelsen said it is reversible if they ever wanted to go back to wood.

Mr. Finrow asked who the original designer was.

Ms. Chave said she thought it was Robert Durham. The church submitted the nomination over 20 years ago.

Ms. Howard agreed the affect from inside would be pretty much the same.

Mr. Lee thought it preferable to the steel.

Mr. Veith asked if the paint was going to be red.

Ms. Chave said it would be sort of a brownish-red and will match existing color throughout the whole building.

Mr. Lee thought it an appropriate solution.
Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board agreed it has enough information to make a decision.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed replacement of the east chancel window, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #110348. The proposal addresses Standard #6 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* as the deterioration and structural stability of the window has been documented and the new replacement feature attempts to match the deteriorated feature in all but materials.

Standard #6 Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

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

MM/SC/HM/MT 11:0:0 Motion approved.

050708.3 DESIGNATIONS

050708.31 Central Building
810 Third Avenue

Applicant Comment:

Kate Krafft reacquainted the Board with the Central Building which is located on an entire half block site along the westward sloping east side of Third Avenue between Columbia and Marion Streets; it was constructed in 1907. It appears to meet three criteria for designation according to the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Ordinance. It meets Criterion C because it is directly associated with the initial period of downtown commercial expansion that occurred after 1902 as a result of the local economic prosperity related to the Klondike Gold Rush and in tandem with explosive population growth and

suburban neighborhood development. During this era modern downtown urban scale began with the construction of the earliest tall steel frame and ferrous concrete office buildings including the 14 story Alaska Building 1903-04 and the 12 story American Savings Bank and Empire Building, 1904-06. There was also a concentration of banking establishments and department stores along 2nd Avenue.

Ms. Krafft said the Trustee Company, headed by Arthur Hawley and Judge W. D. Wood obtained the entire half block site and promoted major real estate development using an innovated “unit ownership” concept. The Trustee Company was established in 1903; the Central Building was identified as Trustee property number six, indicating the property had developed, or was developing, at least five other properties in Seattle, Spokane, Portland, and Los Angeles. The original 21-story design was not fully realized; despite a phase approach to construction, the Central Building provided more office space than any other previously constructed commercial building. From its beginnings, the Central Building was considered a civic center due to its central point location in the business district and the number of civic agencies and organizations housed there, including the Seattle Chamber of Commerce which occupied the entire 8th floor until 1924. The Central Building is also directly associated with early civic planning efforts. A civic center proposal was presented to the municipal plans commission by the Trustee Company partners in 1910. The plan called for formal Beaux Arts inspired civic center with a central mall surrounded by seven major public buildings including a city hall, hall of records, and a county courthouse.

Ms. Krafft said the building meets Criterion D; it is an eight-story commercial office building that was designed and constructed in 1906-1907; as initially designed it was intended to be some twenty stories in height with a massive stepped-back central clock tower. It exhibits an unusual two-part vertical block façade composition since portions of the planned vertical shaft and cap with tower were not constructed. However, as constructed the Central Building incorporates fine Beaux Arts style architectural detailing indicative of the original architectural design and intent.

Ms. Krafft said it is entirely clad with exquisite gray-speckled glazed terra cotta. Terra cotta panels at the base are formed to simulate rusticated stonework while the terra cotta cladding at the shaft has the appearance of smooth cut stone. The north and south elevations nearly mirror each other and are entirely unified with the long west elevation/façade in terms of fenestration, ornament and architectural character. The façade is dominated by a three-story central entrance bay formed by a central 16’ deep setback loggia and capped by a terra cotta balustrade at the third floor level. The building entry is defined by four tapered and polished grey granite columns that extend two stories in height. This colonnade is surmounted by a lintel inscribed with “CENTRAL BUILDING” and flanked by terra cotta ornament including

shields encircled with leaves and scrolls. Above the prominent three bays of the entrance colonnade are three bays of simple rectangular window openings separated by piers decorated with composite pilasters that are capped by lions' heads.

Ms. Krafft said a significant portion of original entry lobby has been preserved; it is particularly distinctive lobby embellished with Greco-Roman inspired decorative motifs. The lobby walls and pillars are entirely clad with a mottled light-gray Alaska marble. Distinctive inlaid bronze Greek meander pattern moulding decorates portions of the marble walls. Other distinctive interior features and finishes include; coffered, ornate plaster ceilings decorated with garlands and dentil moulding, white marble tile flooring with inlaid black marble patterns and green marble panels at the elevator bays. Ceiling coves and column caps include egg-and-dart mouldings. The symmetrical formal lobby plan is accentuated by open flared marble-clad stairwells with wide curved marble banisters and newel posts located to each side of the lobby space.

Ms. Krafft said it meets Criterion F because of its prominence of spatial location, contrasts of siting, age and scale; it is an easily identified visual feature of its neighborhood and it contributes to the distinctive quality and identity the neighborhood. It is located on an entire half block site which was atypical of most downtown commercial buildings constructed during this time. Due to the scale, massing and architectural character the Central Building contrasts with its immediate surroundings and is a distinctive component of the streetscape and downtown urban environment.

In terms of physical integrity, Ms. Krafft said it is a partially realized original design, there are a number of examples of extant buildings that were constructed during this era with only partially realized original designs including the Melborne Building, the J. A. Balarchin Building, The Securities Building, King County Courthouse and Rector Governor Hotel. Although the storefront level has been altered and modernized the majority of the exterior of the Central Building is very well preserved. Originally a highly ornate terracotta cartouche carved to include the company logo was located above the entry way as part of the balustrade; it was removed sometime after 1945 possibly as a result of the 1949 earthquake. A significant portion of the elegant interior lobby is well preserved.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith said he looked at the building and noticed on the south side several bays appear to be original or at least a style that is contemporary with when the building was built.

Ms. Krafft said those storefronts are not shown on the original drawings or the early photographs but they do appear to be very early in the history of the building.

Mr. Veith said as far as he could tell the rest of the storefronts and all the ones on the west side had been altered and the doors into the lobby as well. He is not so clear about the north side of the building and that Ms. Krafft said there used to be a lobby opening at that corner.

Ms. Krafft said there still is a small recessed entry vestibule on the north side that is still intact; it has an intact vestibule with doors, sidelights, transoms and low marble bulkheads. She said it is a quarry tile flooring which she does not believe is part of the original construction.

Mr. Veith asked if the store front system in that bay is very early.

Ms. Krafft said the drawings do not show elevations but they do show the vestibule in a similar configuration and materials and construction do appear to be either original or early construction. She said it is not an alteration; it was part of the original design.

Mr. Veith stated to be sure it is documented so if the inevitable storefront alteration comes up a Board will have some guidance.

Ms. Krafft said the original design had storefronts all along 3rd Avenue; the typical design would have big plate glass windows, prism lights at the mezzanine level and the 2nd story windows. Most of the 2nd story windows and spandrels are there. The mezzanine level has been altered; at least twice the storefronts have been altered. Typically the doors were centered, now they are offset; the drawings from 1954 show the original alterations. All the storefronts were upgraded in 2000 when they did the entry upgrade.

Ms. Sodt said a copy of Ms. Krafft's presentation would be in the file for documentation.

Ms. Krafft said the entry was altered by 1945 because there was a recessed vestibule there too; it was modernized in 1960.

Mr. Abelsen asked, with regard to Criterion C and the urban planning exercise that was not brought to fruition, how Mr. Krafft saw this building still relating to the urban planning effort.

Ms. Krafft said there was a push from 1908 on to create the Plans Commission and apparently the Commission was lobbied by a number of entities as to the design for a civic center. Ultimately the Bogue plan was developed and failed. At one point there was consideration of this building

being part of a civic center plan. It was an innovative plan with proposed underground subways and rail systems and elevators to connect downtown buildings. It didn't happen but it is associated with this building.

Mr. Veith said the architect for the 1954 changes was Young, Richardson, Carelton and Deltie; there are renderings in the lobby that show the 1937 scheme of a bank that was done by Young. It seems like they had a long association.

Ms. Sodt introduced the representative for the owner, Jessica Clawson from McCullough Hill PS.

Ms. Clawson said she and E. J. Maloney from Pinnacle were there on behalf of the property owner; they support designation. They look forward to the Controls and Incentives negotiations.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum agreed with the staff recommendation and said yes on C, D and F; it is a grand building.

Mr. Veith said it is a very striking design in its elegance; he strongly supports designating the building based on standard D. He is less enthusiastic about C and F but comfortable with them.

Mr. Abelsen supported staff recommendation on C, D, and F.

Ms. Strong agreed with the Staff Report and supports C, D and F.

Mr. Martinson supported Staff's recommendation and supports C, D, and F.

Ms. Tremaine said it shows a significant character, interest of value as part of the development, heritage and cultural characteristics of a City, State or Nation. It is a handsome building and she is pleased to see the interior parts of the building seen in the slides will also be protected. She supports based on C, D, and F.

Ms. Nicolas supports based on C, D, and F; she is glad the interior lobby might be protected.

Ms. Howard agreed that C, D, and F are the relevant criteria, especially C given that this was a building that was constructed in phases, that it is a partially realized plan speaks to its connection with the expansion of downtown, the way fortunes ebb and flow.

Mr. Finrow supports based on C, D, and F.

Mr. Matthews agreed with the Staff Report and also found the Bogue planning proposal fascinating; he supports based on C, D, and F and the description of the interior.

Mr. Lee said he assumed that for all the people that just spoke followed the recommendation that the lobby be included.

The Board indicated agreement.

Mr. Lee said it is an historically significant building; it is elegant, handsome; he is thrilled the owner supports the process. He supports based on C, D, and F as written in the Staff Report.

Action:

I move that the Board approve the designation of the Central Building at 801 Third Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified 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.

MM/SC/CN/HM

11:0:0 Motion approved.

050708.4 NOMINATIONS

050708.41 320 Terry Ave. N

Applicant Comment:

Sharon Coleman from Vulcan explained their plan to develop their South Lake Union area land portfolio. She said they have supported designation of a number of their properties in South Lake Union including the New Richmond Laundry, Pacific McKay Building, Ford McKay Building and others. Today they bring two nominations to the Board, one is the 320 Terry Ave which they hope to retain and incorporate into a project; the other is 201 Boren which they do not support the nomination. She introduced Susan Boyle and Sonja Sokol-Furesz from BOLA Architects.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said the 320 Terry Avenue Building is located on the east side of Terry Avenue N between Thomas and Harrison Streets. South Lake

Union started as an early mixed use urban neighborhood: industrial, commercial use buildings scattered with wood frame residential structures of various scales.

Ms. Boyle, BOLA Architects, said the location, across from the former Northern Pacific Railroad Depot, was a pivotal location in terms of subsequent development.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz provided context of the site; today the neighborhood has more consolidated parcels with some half and full block developments. In the late 1800s sawmills and shingle mills were predominant around the lake. Breweries, laundries, clothing, manufacturing were in the neighborhood amongst the low scale residential. In 1909 a Northern Pacific Railroad spur line dropped down along the west side of Lake Union and down Terry Avenue North; there more brick buildings along Westlake. There were primarily low scale, industrial and commercial development continuing into the 1920s; after WWII the South Lake Union industrial base contracted and the residential population declined. Commercial manufacturing uses began to increase and quite a few construction related business located in the neighborhood. There was an extreme grade change between Boren and Terry Avenue N. She said a 1962 aerial photo showed the construction of I-5; Ms. Sokol-Furesz said the freeway cut off the neighborhood from Capitol Hill which further solidified the link between the neighborhood and the lake as well as the South Lake Union and Eastlake neighborhoods. The freeway made the neighborhood more attractive for larger scale residential and business development which increased after the 1960s.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said current contextual views show the two story brick warehouse building in contrast to the newer, mostly larger scaled development. The new street car line traveling along Terry Avenue North sits right next to remnants of the original spur line. The 1914 drawings by James Schact a sole practitioner. He went on as part of Schact, Young and Meyers in the 1920s to do numerous commercial, residential and institutional projects. This building was constructed in 1915; in 1917 there was a mix of dwellings and low scale industrial buildings in the area. In 1917, the Kuhn Tractor Company, a vehicle manufacturer was the occupant at that time. By 1928 Kelly Goodwin Hardwoods occupied the building until the 1980s; they were established in 1924. They wholesaled hardwood flooring and trim. From 1928 – 39 they leased the building from the railroad and in 1953 Kelly Goodwin Hardwoods purchased the building and stayed there until the 1980s when they were acquired by Pankratz Lumber. Since Kelly Goodwin Hardwoods moved out in the 1980s the building has primarily served as professional offices and light warehousing; a magazine distributor occupied the main story.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said the building sits on a 60 x 120 site and has a concrete foundation with full basement, has bearing brick perimeter walls with concrete base and decorative details on the primary west façade. The interior structure consists of heavy timber post and beam. The four bays are separated by pilasters; each bay consists of one large opening at the first story and then an opening at the 2nd story with three 12/12 single hung wood sash windows; the windows are original. Detailing on the west façade consists of a soldier course above the window openings, brick sills, and concrete details: banding at the parapet base, darts at the top of each pilaster, blank shield detail peaked parapets and between the first and second story is a rectangular detail with a diamond in the center. She said it is a straightforward building but has nice detailing.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said openings on the first story have non-original infill but the openings are legible; the third bay from the left has an overhead door, it is not original but is consistent with 1937 tax record photo showing an overhead door in that location. The alley view shows the same bay rhythm and window grouping as primary west façade but without the decorative details and instead of the face brick, uses common brick of the sidewalls. The original windows remain in most of the openings including the middle two bays at the first story. Along the top of the sidewall is signage remnant.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said the interior was originally open on each level and that is, for the most part, still the case. The structure consists of 9 x 9 posts, 15 feet on center supporting 9 x 12 beams. On the 2nd story the beams run east and west and rest directly on the perimeter wall brick pilasters. The interior tenant improvements have had a limited impact; the exposed brick walls are still visible. 2 x 6 wood car decking is set directly on the beams and forms the roof plane. She said other extant brick commercial or industrial buildings for the most part are less intact and also a little younger than the subject building. Along Dexter Avenue North there are more buildings from the later 1920s and early 1930s with most having been painted or with storefront or window alterations.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said they found nothing that associated the building with a significant person, historical event so it does not meet Criteria A or E. With regard to Criterion C, the building is associated with the industrial development of the South Lake Union neighborhood and the circa 1912 Railroad Freight Depot formerly located directly Terry Avenue N. The building was occupied for 60 years by Kelly Goodwin Hardwoods and other cabinetmaker and represents early construction related business that tended to cluster in the area. The building's siting on the railroad spur line and across from the freight depot as well as its early presence in the neighborhood makes it significantly associated with the industrial development of South Lake Union which is a significant aspect of Seattle's economic heritage.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said the building meets Criterion D; it is a largely intact early 20th Century low scale brick warehouse building; it is well detailed structure of heavy timber and unreinforced brick masonry. It is characterized by the two-story height, shaped parapet, clear four bays separated by brick pilasters, large original multi-pane wood windows at the 2nd story, the use of brick and concrete decorative details and the largely open interior volume with heavy timber is visible. She said they do not believe it meets Criterion E, that it is an outstanding work of a designer or builder. James Shack was a prominent practitioner in Seattle; he independently and in partnerships designed buildings such as the United Methodist Church, the Morrison Hotel and the Civic Center/Civic Auditorium complex. This is a well-executed design but it doesn't appear to be outstanding within Shack's body of work.

With regard to Criterion F, Ms. Sokol-Furesz said it is located on the east side of Terry Avenue North, mid block between Harrison and Thomas Streets. It presents a contrast in age and scale with the new, much larger full-block development occurring around the neighborhood. The exposed brick walls and detailing of the building convey its era of construction and identify it as an element of the formerly industrial character of the neighborhood. In this way it contributes to the distinctive quality and identity of the neighborhood and meets Criterion F. The building was cited in the 1975 Nyberg and Steinbrueck survey as being community significant. In the survey from 1995 it is also noted as having community significance. In the 2005 South Lake Union context statement it is one of the oldest extant warehouse buildings notable for its distinct bays, simple ornament and multi-paned sashes at the 2nd floor windows.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith noted the windows are 9/9 rather than 12/12 as stated in the presentation.

Mr. Matthews asked if the rosettes over the openings were from a seismic retrofitting.

Ms. Boyle said yes and it is also evident in the hallway corridor where there are ties at the roof and floor levels but that appears to be the extent of the effort.

Mr. Abelsen asked if there was anything significant with the heavy timber frame/construction aside from the spatial or volumetric qualities of the building.

Ms. Boyle said it is heavy timber and not wood frame according to the current code; it is typical, with steel ties between pieces, car-decking, and from a

material alloy and what buildings are made of now and what they were made of then it seems to be representative of an era that is fully gone.

Mr. Finrow asked if there are other buildings in South Lake Union that have been designated.

Ms. Boyle said the Van Vorst Building is a heavy timber, masonry building located on Boren a block north; it is a larger building in size and height. Other buildings in the area that have been recognized are the Troy Laundry building is brick clad, the Seattle Times building is an Art Deco building from the 1930s, the Metropolitan New Richmond Laundry, the Supply Laundry which has trusses rather than heavy timber, Pacific Ford McKay are terracotta clad concrete buildings.

Mr. Finrow said it is somewhat unique; by looking at the volume of buildings in South Lake Union the number that have historical designation is fairly limited. This would be adding to a limited palette.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews agreed with the Staff Report and said regarding D, it is not distinguished architecture but he thought it a very good example of commercial development from that time. The fact that it was designed by a good architect shows; the proportions are very nice and also the survival of the original windows is an important fact.

Mr. Finrow agreed with Mr. Matthews.

Ms. Howard agreed with the Staff Report and said it was particularly nice that there is detailing both in the brickwork and in the concrete. She agreed with the Staff Report.

Ms. Nicolas agreed with Mr. Matthews and supported the nomination based on C; it is a good reminder of the industrial history of the South Lake Union area. She said it is great that it is intact; it has good rhythm and simple execution but nice detail.

Ms. Tremaine didn't think it was a very interesting building; there were others in the past several months that she thought were more interesting but were denied by the Board. If it is nominated, D would be the Criterion. She said she has a great respect for BOLA, if it a good example of 20th Century Modern Warehouse they know what they are talking about. The signage is the most interesting thing on it; she supports the nomination for now.

Mr. Martinson supports the nomination but wondered about the interior timber and car decking; it is an important characteristic of the building although common. He said he wondered in the future, if this building were nominated, if it would be turned into just an exterior shell with totally restructured interior.

Mr. Lee said perhaps the Board should think about doing the exterior and interior for the nomination just so it is covered; if it isn't done now we can't do it later.

Ms. Strong supported the nomination; she said it will contribute to the neighborhood texture and a nice reminder of the history of the neighborhood.

Mr. Abelsen said it is a relatively understated structure; he supports the nomination. He said the fact that it is relatively unchanged in many ways is significant and the history as explained by the applicant is very significant to looking at it as a Criterion C candidate as well.

Mr. Veith said the Board has seen a lot of nice buildings lately that have not been landmarked; there have been various reasons for not doing that. He said people who remember anything of what he's said over the last five years will probably remember that he has often been more interested in these standard mill construction building than some of the other Board members. He said one of the earliest buildings he looked at while on the Board was the building at Golden Gardens; the Board talked about that, if one just looks at the shell it doesn't have as much meaning as being able to go into the building and appreciate how it is built. He said that is what is most appealing to him about this as a potential landmark is being able to see a very clear statement of mill construction. He said the Board has looked at some other buildings in this area that have been landmarked, where interiors were looked at but ended up not designating the interiors for a variety of reasons. He said this without looking at the interior he is not quite as excited about this building as he is with the interior and that he thinks strongly that if the Board is going to consider designation, the interior needs to be considered. On the other hand, the other big advantage to this building is it has a high degree of integrity as compared to other buildings of this type that the Board has looked at. He said he would also like to think more about including C and F when coming to the point of designation; at this point is that he thinks the building should be nominated and include the interior.

Mr. Hannum agreed with Ms. Tremaine that the building is not very interesting but he would support nomination primarily because it is so intact. He also agreed with Mr. Veith that the interior is important.

Mr. Lee said it helps that the owners support because the building is fairly unremarkable in one sense but the Board has to balance its interest in historic

buildings; there is a whole range of history that we have to be aware of and being in good condition certainly helps him to support. He supports nomination based on D.

Mr. Finrow stated that there are very few historic structures in that neighborhood and they are all rapidly disappearing. He said buildings that one might think of as industrial vernacular, which in a way this is, are completely appropriate to save as quickly as possible.

Action:

I move approval of the 320 Terry Avenue North building 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 and interior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration for designation will be scheduled for June 18, 2008; that this action conforms to this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RM/CH

11:0:0 Motion approved.

050708.42

201 Boren Ave. N

Susan Boyle, BOLA Architects, said this building is in the same area as the building she just presented but this is more on the southern edge of South Lake Union, very close to Denny and the Denny Triangle. An overview of both neighborhoods was provided in the nomination report. There is a grade change between Terry Avenue and Boren Avenue that is even greater at the block that this building is located on. Because of the grade change, the “lack of through-ness” of John Street and that Fairview Avenue and Westlake Avenues are major arterials the site and building are obscure. Ms. Boyle said dramatic changes occurred in this neighborhood due to late 1950s planning and the 1960s construction of the freeway. At this time a number of professional offices buildings were built at this time; these former industrial areas were gradually changing.

Ms. Boyle said the subject building was constructed in 1954 with an addition in 1956; it is a two story building with approximately 5000 square feet per floor. It is a simple rectangle with projecting stair element that has dramatic signage on it, a consistent band of windows with composite panels below the projection of the 2nd floor over the first floor. The building was doubled in size in 1956. It is a straight level building; the first part of the building consists of a carport section and the second part has an infill bay corresponding to service needs that is concrete block and infill at the lower floor and a separated first floor office. The upper floor is consistent in terms of the original design; it had clear glazing and now it has glazing film and some replacement glass. The south façade has painted base with rustic strips

of stained cedar on top. The far north wall was extended all along the north property line and serves as a retaining wall. The interiors have been changed considerably; dropped ceilings added, partitions, corridors are a double loaded system with an assortment of ductwork.

Ms. Boyle said that Robert Dietz, the architect for the subject building, was a significant mid-century architect who did extraordinary work. He received a degree from the University of Washington before going on to MIT where he graduated. He worked with Jay Lister Holmes, a very prominent architect in Seattle's history and worked on the Catherine Blaine Junior High School in Magnolia. He formed Waldren and Dietz partnership which lasted approximately six years. Dietz was not only an architect practitioner but also became a teacher at UW in 1947; in 1958 when the College of Architecture and Urban Planning was established he was made a full professor and he left the Waldren and Dietz partnership at that time. He became acting Dean in 1960 and full Dean in 1962.

Ms. Boyle showed photos of the Wolf Residence designed by Dietz in 1948 and for which he received an AIA award in 1950 and Dietz's own residence which show the simplicity he was working with, the clarity on interior organization of rooms and openness, and close relationship to landscape and courtyard rooms as well; these were cited by Victor Steinbrueck in his 1953 AIA Guide to Seattle. Ms. Boyle provided photos of numerous area schools designed by Waldren and Dietz as well as an office building on SW Fairview that was cited by Steinbrueck in his 1962 book, "Cityscapes". The short-lived firm worked together on about a dozen projects.

Ms. Boyle compared the subject building to other modern mid-century office buildings and while they are consistent in type as small-scale office buildings, they do show the range of architectural expression at this period: 501 Dexter Avenue N, 215 8th Avenue N, 1945 Yale Place E and 1264 Fairview Avenue E among others.

Ms. Boyle provided an evaluation that the building does not meet Criteria A or B. In terms of Criterion C is it associated with the commercial development of the upper portions of South Lake Union and the Denny Triangle in the 1950s and 1960s in general but not in a significant way. This building is an example of modern style architecture with its simple massing, rectangular shape, the recesses and projections of the floors; it is simple, functional. The materials used are typical of the era: painted CMU, exposed post and beams, posit panels and aluminum windows. Ms. Boyle said in looking at other office buildings of this era, it doesn't compare well. She said it does not meet Criterion D because it is more typical rather than distinctive. With regard to Criterion E she said Dietz was a capable designer as is evident more in his house design; this building is not an outstanding example of his work. Ms. Boyle said the building does not meet Criterion F because the

building is set back on the site and is located in an obscure area where it is not easily seen.

Board Questions:

Mr. Finrow asked who proposed the nomination of this building.

Ms. Coleman said the property owner (Vulcan) proposed the nomination to take the risk away later on when they develop the site.

Ms. Chave said a number of owners are proactive in that way.

Mr. Martinson asked if regrading had been done in the area or if the “cliff” was natural.

Ms. Boyle said the site was a very steep hillside; it is a gradual northern downward slope to the lake and Westlake Avenue was a creek bed early on. This site was a continuation of Capitol Hill before it was defined by the freeway. She said there may have been some grading at the lower level on Terry Avenue.

Mr. Veith said the Board received an email from Michael Houser stating that this building won a Seattle AIA Honor award in 1955; he wondered if the applicant felt that was a significant factor to consider.

Ms. Boyle said it wasn't something she was aware of until Mr. Houser brought it to her attention at which time she looked it up on the AIA Archives. She said the Honor Awards program was started in 1950 and the list includes not only the AIA awards but also awards such as the Seattle Times Home of the Year, National Merit Awards, Church Architecture Guild awards etc. The Board has seen some buildings that have received Honor awards and has designated some and not others. In thinking about how this building was viewed by its peers it is important to know the Honor Award was for the first section which was constructed in 1954. Recognition by one's peers also includes publications; Steinbrueck did not include this building in his Cityscapes book, while he did cite other projects by Waldren and Dietz. Not all buildings are eligible or submitted for Honor Awards so it is hard to know how to weigh that although it was helpful that Mr. Houser brought it up. She did disagree with his citation of Waldren and Dietz as being a really important and powerful firm; the firm that had Waldren involved continued and did quite a bit of work and at one time had Polk, a former State Senator, involved.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said he would not support nomination; the building has nice qualities about it but the house designs that were presented were more representative of Dietz's grasp of that style. The other representative buildings are better equipped to express what that firm and he may have done as a designer for the modern style.

Ms. Strong agreed with the Staff Report not to nominate the building.

Mr. Martinson agreed with the Staff Report not to nominate the building.

Ms. Tremaine agreed with the Staff Report and said there were better examples of that style and also that Mr. Dietz had other work that was more compelling.

Ms. Nicholas said she would not nominate the building.

Ms. Howard said no; there are some nice features on the building but those are better done in other buildings.

Mr. Finrow agreed with the Staff Report.

Mr. Matthews thought the building looked fresh and new when built but it hasn't survived as a great representative of that era; he said he would not support nomination.

Mr. Hannum said it was interesting that it won the award in 1955 but it is important to note that the 1956 addition was put on afterward which is unfortunate; it was a better building before. He agreed with the staff report and would not support nomination.

Mr. Veith said he asked the question about the honor award as he was curious; there were a lot of buildings that received honor awards in this period that received them mainly because the style was such a departure from what had gone on before; it was so simple and so stripped down, and removed from the kind of approach to architecture that was common before the war that the "Modern missionaries" really wanted to appreciate these simple buildings. He said as Mr. Matthews pointed out, these buildings don't survive very well; there is so little to them, there is not enough guts in the design to carry them into our era. He thought the building might meet Criterion D but the main problem is the building is just not significant; it does embody a lot of the characteristics of the style and is distinctive in that way but it doesn't do that in a significant way. He would not support nomination.

Mr. Lee liked the original design of the first section of the building; if it was a green landscape it would be significant but it isn't significant as it is; he agreed that it should not be nominated.

Action:

I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the 201 Boren Avenue North Building at 201 Boren Ave N as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the Staff Report.

MM/SC/HM/CH

11:0:0 Motion approved.

Mr. Finrow left at 6:00 pm.

050708.43

Brasa/Metropolitan Press Printing Company

2107 Third Avenue

Ms. Sodt reported this building was included in the downtown survey inventory as a Category 1 Building; the City prepared the nomination for this building.

Mimi Sheridan, on behalf of the City presented the nomination for the Brasa Building, located at 3rd and Lenora at the south end of Belltown. It is a distinctive building that is both intact and interesting. She provided contextual history of the site and said that printing was an important aspect of Seattle in the early days; by the 1920s there were over 1000 printers in the City that did more than \$2 million in work annually. The larger printers had their own buildings but many were actually located in basements or in other buildings. She provided a photo of one of the oldest, Lohman and Hanford, which was located next to the railroad for easy access. When the 2nd Denny regrade was completed in 1911, a lot of businesses moved to that area over a period of time; it offered cheap land and a lot more movement for trucks.

Ms. Sheridan said the area became a low density area of service business for downtown. There were a number of large printing businesses located in the vicinity of the Belltown cottages; the Frame Printing Company building being the only one remaining. By 1940, directories showed there at least 12 large printers in the Belltown area; all the buildings except Brasa, and one other, are either gone or very much altered. All the ones in the vicinity of Western have been demolished for condos.

Ms. Sheridan said Metropolitan Printing, which was the first tenant of this building, was one of the oldest and largest of the printing companies. It started in Pioneer Square and moved to this building in 1923; they were in the basement of the Central Building for a long time. They did not own or build this building although their name is on the original blueprints so it was built for them; it was owned by George Thompson. The Metropolitan Printing Company was predominantly family run and was managed by a woman, Agnes Handley from 1920 – 1948. It was her nephew who sold the company to Craftsman in 1968; it sort of petered away over time.

Metropolitan Printing occupied the subject building for seven years. This building has a strong industrial history; this is the most intact remaining industrial building in Belltown. It had 50 years of light industry; after Metropolitan Printing moved out, the Daily Racing Form, another printing company, moved in, Puget Sound Tent and Awning which was there a long time. It was vacant for a while and then turned into retail and office use and then the restaurant that is there today.

Ms. Sheridan said the building itself stands out and is notable for its style. It has a symmetrical composition of tall two story arches, topped by parapet and red roof. The windows and doors are particularly notable; the arched windows have divided fan lights. The restaurant entry is new and new door and grill are the only noticeable change in the building.

Ms. Sheridan said she has surveyed every commercial district in Belltown, Queen Anne, and Capital Hill; this building is one of the most detailed buildings. The building evokes the mission style with its niches/pseudo windows, the spandrel detail and the green tiles. She pointed out the seismic upgrade rosettes. The rear and the sides of the building are not notable except that they are intact.

Ms. Sheridan said there have been few alterations to the building exterior and showed a 1937 photo which looks the same as current but thought one window might have been replaced. The original clay tile has been replaced with metal tile. The mission style is fairly unusual in Seattle and particularly unusual in commercial and industrial buildings; this one does a good job of evoking a northwest vision of California Missions with its buff brick, tile roof, repeated use of arches and shaped parapet. The Mission style in Seattle is used primarily in apartment buildings, some large mansions and a few public buildings; the L'Amourita is the best known.

Ms. Sheridan said George Stoddard was the architect. He practiced here for 40 years primarily in an individual practice; when this building was done he was practicing with his father. His father was a naval architect so she isn't sure that it was a design partnership and may have been more of a business deal to share an office. For the last five years of his career he was in partnership with Francis Huggert but basically he was an independent practitioner with a staff. Stoddard was very active professionally in civic affairs. He is known for his utilitarian designs late in his career: the stadiums, the aqua theater. He was noted as a hospital designer and did schools; he did numerous modernistic commercial work in the 1940s and 1950s. He did Art Deco work in the 1930s: the Seattle University Bookstore which was built as a Canada Dry Bottling Plant among others. Stoddard had a vast residential practice and in the 1930s may have been the most active designer; he did standard design for developers. He did everything from cottages to large

Colonial Revival and also did low income projects and was on the team for Yesler Terrace.

Ms. Sheridan said Brasa and two other nearby buildings are the beginning of Stoddard's commercial work, where he is taking romantic ideas and making very simple, ordinary commercial buildings different which, she believes, is distinctive and important work of his. She said the subject building is one of the last intact remnants of Belltown's industrial heritage, particularly its printing plants. It is an example of the Mission Style especially in this application and it is an outstanding work of Stoddard and really fits in to this time period of his design development.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum asked Ms. Sheridan about the connection with Sam Israel that she mentioned in her report.

Ms. Sheridan deferred to the next presenters because they represent Samis, who still owns the property.

Ms. Howard said Doctors Hospital does still exist and is part of the Virginia Mason complex.

Mr. Veith asked if Ms. Sheridan looked at the interiors.

Ms. Sheridan said it was her impression that interior volumes still exist; there is a narrow mezzanine in the restaurant and the upstairs is fairly new.

Owner Comment:

William Justin, Samis Foundation said Sam Israel bought the building in 1942 for a shoe repair business. Mr. Justen reiterated the City nominated this building and he said the nomination was incomplete as of last year and they asked Larry Johnson to do a more thorough analysis. He said Mission Style architecture is the dominant feature of the building. From what he can tell there were never any Mission Style elements on the interior; it was simply a façade applied to an ordinary commercial building. They prefer the building not be nominated; they have taken good care of it and have no specific plans for it but want the flexibility of planning of the future because they also own the property next door and someday would like to do something with the property. In the meantime they'll maintain it. Tile damaged during an earthquake was replaced with metal tile.

Melody McCutcheon, Land Use Attorney, assisting the Samis Company said with respect to Criterion C, there was an unusual degree of emphasis on this building being a printing plant as if it was a building type. She asked if a printing plant is really a building type that is significantly distinctive from

other light industrial buildings. The building's actual association with printing is just seven years when Metropolitan Printing occupied the space. With respect to Criterion D, Ms. McCutcheon compared the building to L'Amourita which embodies the distinctive Mission Style; the subject building has elements of that but she questions whether it really embodies the distinctive Mission Style characteristics. Ms. McCutcheon said Larry Johnson would discuss Stoddard and Criterion E and why he thinks this is not an outstanding work of the architect. Ms. McCutcheon said being a low scale building in comparison to large buildings around it, it not enough to make it significant so she said it doesn't meet Criterion F. She asked the building not be nominated.

Larry Johnson agreed with Ms. Sheridan's information, but said that he has a different frame of reference. He said the build has a handsome façade, but it is only a façade. He said the building has basic integrity. The tiles have been changed, the fenestration is intact, the signage is different but the building is in fairly good shape. The main floor interior is the restaurant and no original interior is left. The 2nd floor has post and beam construction. He said Metropolitan Printing was only in this building for seven years and the Daily Racing Form was there only 4 years. The printing industry started downtown in Pioneer Square; the printing presses were fairly small and could fit almost anywhere because their loads were light until larger equipment came in later on.

Mr. Johnson showed a photo of the Seattle Times in the Denny building from 1902-16. It was built to their specification but was not owned by the Seattle Times. He provided photos of a couple other similar area printing businesses of that era. It had large presses and heavy equipment in the basement. In 1931 Metropolitan Printing moved to their own building, designed by George Stoddard; it was a more of an industrial building. Mr. Johnson said one of the last great printing buildings in Seattle was the Seattle Post Intelligencer. Nowadays printing companies are more likely to be located in a warehouse out in Redmond. He said typologically it is a store and loft and building and was probably built for a variety of uses, general manufacturing and warehouse. He said with respect to Criterion D, the Mission Style is curvilinear roof gables, tile roofs, expressed roof rafters, arched arcades and entrances, balconies and smooth plaster walls. The Mission was introduced in 1893 and became popularized during the Chicago Exhibition. He showed photos of examples of Mission Style architecture in the area: L'Amourita, Roland Denny residence, the Hydro House and the Fremont Library. The subject building has the curvilinear roof, the tile roof, Mission bell, arched windows and entrances are some of the forms of Mission Style; he said it is more of a façade.

Mr. Johnson said this is not an outstanding work of the architect. He was a capable architect known for his modern style; his greatest works were the

Memorial Stadium and the University of Washington Stadium. He said this building is an eclectic work of an early Northwest Modernist; his later buildings are more typical of his style.

Regarding Criterion F, Mr. Johnson said the building is not prominent and is visible only from across the street and is more of an infill building.

Board Questions:

Ms. Strong asked about the signage on the side of the building for the Grand Furniture Company and what the association that company had with the building.

Ms. Sheridan said during the depression a lot of buildings were used as warehouses but she didn't know anything in particular about the Grand Furniture Company.

Public Comment:

Kate Krafft said there may be one or two extant garages on the edge of the Denny regrade and the commercial core of Virginia and Lenora that were designed by Stoddard; one of them may have been in a Mission/Spanish eclectic style. She agreed with Ms. Sheridan the early work of Stoddard's work is important particularly because of the Romantic Eclectic styles he embraced for commercial and residential work prior to the more Modernistic work he is known for.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews said the building is commercial eclectic in style which in its own right is worth celebrating by landmarking. In the original Missions or Mission Revival he never saw the arches going through two stories but he thought it was just an expression of the vitality of commercial architecture at that time. The fact that it is just a façade is so normal in commercial buildings that he didn't see it as detrimental. The Metropolitan Press only occupied this building for seven years but that was the first use of the building so they thought a lot of it and it represents their early success from which they moved on to a building of their own. He agreed with the Staff Report that it is associated with the early days of printing and it embodies visible characteristics of a group of architectural styles. While not the outstanding work of a designer, it showed the beginning of his career. He supports nomination.

Ms. Howard agreed with the Staff Report and the comments by Mr. Matthews but added that as someone who has done some typesetting, light is extraordinarily important. The high arched windows speak to her as trying to

get as much light in to the building as possible given the constraints. The light wells, which no longer exist, would have also contributed to that. She said it may also have elements of a storefront and loft building but the windows are significant in terms of its original use.

Ms. Nicolas supported nomination because it has a strong industrial history. It has a lot of detail and style and the arched designs create an illusion of fantasy.

Ms. Tremaine said the building is really interesting, unique and one of a kind and she would support nomination based on the Staff Report.

Mr. Martinson supported nomination based on Criterion D and agreed with Mr. Matthews' reasoning; less so for C and E.

Ms. Strong supported nomination and said that with regard to eclectic architectural style Stoddard was eclectic in his design career. She supported the Staff Report, specifically for D and possibly for E.

Mr. Abelsen supported the nomination and agreed with Ms. Krafft's calling it "Romantic Eclectic" style. He thinks Stoddard got his hands on something and explored it and then went on to something else. He isn't sure whether or not this is a building that is designed as a best example of what he can do and would like to consider that more. The design of the building is significant unto itself, whatever style might be attributed to it; it does have hints of what might be considered Mission Style, but it is crafted quite well. He doesn't think its siting is of great importance for consideration and it doesn't evoke any industrial aspect of it although the façade is unique as it was a light industrial use building. He supports nomination.

Mr. Veith did not support nomination; the façade is interesting in a curious way. It is not an outstanding work of the designer and it indicative of a kind of searching and not a conclusion in design; it doesn't embody any particular style or approach. The industrial building nominated earlier had the advantage of having a complete design that included an interior; this building would have been more interesting had it maintained its light wells and if the interiors were more of a factor to be considered. It is an incomplete building, not that it lacks integrity in its façade just that it has a design that wasn't complete thought out. It doesn't reach the threshold of significance.

Mr. Hannum said he thought the building is significant regardless of the category of style it may fall into. It is heavily influenced by the Mission Revival Style and there are so few buildings in Seattle that are Mission Revival. He supports nomination based on C, D and E.

Mr. Lee worked upstairs in this building and it never struck him as significant. The style is unhandsome and looks early Romanesque more than Mission Revival Style. He did not support nomination.

Mr. Veith added that it is not necessary for it to be a specific style and he is fine with it being an eclectic building; his feeling is in this case the eclectic feelings of the architect didn't get congealed very well into a building design. Other buildings had strong cohesive thought; in this building it is just not there.

Mr. Lee said regardless of the style it doesn't seem resolved enough to be a significant building.

Action:

I move approval of the Metropolitan Press Printing Co. /Brasa Building at 2107 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; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for July 2, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/HM/RM

8:0:2 Motion approved.

Mr. Lee and Mr. Veith opposed.

050708.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

050708.51 John B. Allen School: Air Raid Siren
6532 Phinney Ave N

Ms. Chave presented the signed Controls and Incentives agreement for the Air Rain Siren, owned by the City.

Mr. Abelsen said the color of paint for the Air Raid Siren should be included in the review process.

Ms. Chave said the structure itself is included. She said if it is repainted in kind it is not subject to review, however.

Ms. Sodt said a Certificate of Approval would be required to paint it a different color.

Mr. Abelsen said it has such public vision; it is a beacon and right now he doesn't agree with the current color.

Ms. Chave said she could put something in the record about including the Board when it comes time to repaint the structure.

Ms. Howard asked Ms. Chave if “in-kind maintenance” implied repainting with the same color.

Ms. Chave said yes

Action:

I move approval of the Controls and Incentives Agreement for the Air Raid Siren at the site of the John B. Allen School.

MM/SC/TV/MH 10:0:0 Motion approved.

050708.52 John B. Allen School
6532 Phinney Ave N
Request for extension

Ms. Chave reported the building owner, the Seattle School District, requested a 36 month extension. She said that the District is in the process of selling the building; the Phinney Neighborhood Association is trying to purchase it. She said that typically a one year extension is the longest given so the Board can check in on progress.

I move that the Board approve an extension for consideration of Controls and Incentives of the John B. Allen School for a period of one year.

MM/SC/TV/CH 10:0:0 Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator