



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 359/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, June 18, 2008– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Henry Matthews
Mark Hannum

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:31 PM.

061808.1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Approval of May 7, 2008 Minutes Deferred.

061808.2 **CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

061808.21 First Church of Christ Scientist
2520 E. Denny Way

Ms. Chave summarized the proposed exterior alterations, including window alterations, and site alterations, including accessible ramp.

Peter McBride, project architect, explained they sought approval for some modifications from a previous Certificate of Approval. They are changing from condos to townhomes and because of that change, each unit has to have one exterior entrance and there needs to be some exterior open space. They propose to preserve all stained glass; in the previous Certificate of Approval they were going to use a triple paned system with a clear glass that sandwiched the clear glass.

Ms. Strong arrived at 3:35 pm.

Mr. McBride said that working with the City, they have been able to meet energy code conditions without the clear glass so will focus on saving the stained glass and will restore it to its original condition. They propose aluminum storefront in front of sliding panel that contains the original stained glass. They will replace some clear glass windows at the baseline.

Michelle Wang said both are wood frame windows with a similar size profile.

Mr. McBride explained the modification to existing windows and said that many of the ones they propose to enlarge occur on the alley (West) elevation. There are nine existing windows that they propose to enlarge; they will align existing stone coursing and existing pattern and rhythm and fenestration. They will maintain the existing sill profiling and the new windows will be much closer to the exterior to deal with water issues. They propose to remove three windows at the alley (West) elevation for new unit entries.

Ms. Wang said they propose to pour a new step from the alley; the old windows are actually sitting up at the edge of the alley, half buried in asphalt. In order for the doors to function and to get good drainage they provided one step up.

Mr. McBride said another opening will be made for the garage door; the opening must be larger than they proposed in the original Certificate of Approval to accommodate a larger turning radius. The stone will be cut along existing mortar joint and will be retooled to match existing finish. There will be a new concrete header; it will be recessed back 1" – 2" from the stone façade. Because of the garage use, they will have to provide ventilation; there is an existing opening at alley grade in which they propose to installed aluminum louvers.

Mr. McBride said on the South elevation three windows will be removed to create new entries. They will follow the same pattern as they did on the west; they will reuse existing openings and enlarged them to accommodate entries. The existing of the head jamb will align with the existing to maintain the existing pattern and rhythm. The head height is the same. The size of the corner balconies will be slightly modified based on updated field measurements.

Ms. Conti arrived at 3:45 PM.

Mr. McBride said on the south elevation there are some "lanterns" which are corner balcony new openings; it is not really visible from the exterior but they have tried to maintain a connection to existing stone coursing. There are new openings on the west elevation; the head, jamb and sill all align with existing openings or existing

stone coursing lines. Another opening on the west elevation will be for entry/egress; it will align with openings at the base and the window above it.

Mr. McBride explained other modifications to the exterior including an accessible ramp to one unit; they propose to install it on the south, main elevation of building. He said the building will maintain its historical prominent corner. On the alley elevation they propose to install new roof deck penthouses at existing roof deck elevation; they will provide enclosed stairs. The roof penthouses will be set back from the parapet to minimize visibility. New metal guardrails to meet code requirements will be installed; they will be installed about 4" – 6" from the coping. The rail is 22" back from the face of the parapet.

Mr. Finrow arrived at 3:55 PM.

Mr. Veith thought the rail looked like it was closer to the outside skin looking at the westernmost corner.

Ms. Wang said they will not modify the stone so it won't be any closer.

Mr. McBride explained they plan to provide screening on the south elevation for the unit entries; they propose the metal screens to follow the same rhythm and pattern of the existing openings. The pattern they propose is based on the existing stained glass pattern. On the north stair that leads to a new entrance they will replace a window with a door. The gas meters will be installed on the lower portion of exterior wall, screened by existing stair wall. He said the HVAC unit will be installed on the roof to serve common areas; it will not be visible. On the main east staircase they propose the middle door will serve common space and the doors to the left and right are unit entry doors. Concrete planters will be added to create a sense of enclosure between entries.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked if the applicant will come back for lighting and signage.

Mr. McBride confirmed they would, and stated there are some existing lights they will reuse in the interim.

Ms. Tremaine asked if the penthouses would be visible.

Mr. McBride said they would be painted to match the existing siding but would be mostly glass.

Ms. Wang said there is a small shed roof atop each cone and circular stair.

Mr. McBride stated the side walls would be glass; there is one wall on the interior that will be solid.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee reported that ARC had seen the application; the most dramatic changes were from the alleyway. He said that although they are a significant change from what is there now he doesn't think they are detrimental to the building. He said the changes to the front of the building, including the new ramp location, seem to be an improvement.

Mr. Abelsen and Mr. Veith agreed.

Mr. Abelsen stated that the applicants have been very conscious and sensitive in the way they are trying to adaptively reuse this building. He said the structures on the west side of the roof are a departure but they are not really in the direct public eye so he feels they are acceptable.

Mr. Veith expressed some concern about the west elevation but thought because it is the alley said most changes would be difficult to perceive from the alley and don't interfere with the character defining features.

Mr. Lee thought it was good the front steps are being respected.

Ms. Tremaine asked if the west side was now butted up against other townhouses (located on the neighboring site).

Mr. McBride said that was true and very little of the west side will be visible.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the proposed exterior alterations, including window alterations, and site alterations, including accessible ramp.

This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #106145 as the proposed work 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/CH 10:0:0 Motion approved.

061808.22

Joshua Green Building
1425 4th Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the proposed changes for exterior alterations including removal and replacement of non-historic storefronts with a new aluminum storefront system; a new metal canopy system; new exterior lighting; replicate original cornice based on photo documentation and drawings(original cornice damaged in 1949); replacement of non-historic aluminum windows on the secondary south and west elevations with new double-hung wood metal-clad windows, with some new window configuration; and minor reconfiguration of doors on alleyway.

Applicant comments:

Eugenia Woo, Artifacts Consulting, explained the Joshua Green Building, which was built in 1912, would be undergoing a phased rehabilitation. There would be no change to the terra cotta cladding and outside of painting there would be no change to the original windows on the main façade. The main work will be on the storefront level and the non primary façade on the west and south; they will be replicating the cornice. The existing storefront dates from around 1990; except for the entrance to the building on 4th, the old Carroll's Jewelers storefront was installed circa 1967. They propose to replace with a compatible new storefront system; it will be aluminum and will be compatible with the original storefront. She introduced Patrick Chatfield, Weaver Architects.

Mr. Chatfield explained the proposed project; he said on the retail level they proposed to remove the green marble that had been installed for Carroll's Jewelers in 1967 and reinstate the original terracotta beneath. They propose to replace the storefront system and within each of the bays will leave the terracotta and the previously replaced stonecotta (a few years ago the stone columns were replaced with the stonecotta) and will replace the storefronts with a new aluminum system. They propose a semi-custom profile that has more of an articulation like what is at Smith Tower and it looks a bit more handcrafted. They also propose new canopies at the storefront level. They will come out 4' on the 4th Avenue side and 10' on the Pike Street side; the 10' requirement is because the bus shelters on Pike Street will be removed. The canopies are steel frame with a white translucent glass. They will be continuing some exterior columnar sconces that were on either side of the Rite Aid entrance on both elevations. Cross bracing will be visible on both sides; it is for the seismic retrofit and will be behind the glass in two bays, one in the center bay on 4th Avenue and the other on the 2nd to last western bay on Pike Street. The lighting will continue up the columns as accent lighting on the 4th and 8th floors.

The cornice was removed and they propose to replace it with PGRG, Polymer Modified Glass Fiber Reinforced Gypsum. They have been working with Architectural Reproductions in Portland to custom build the cornice. They will replicate the original cornice using historic photos. A packet of finishes was circulated; the existing primary façade window sash and trim will be repainted the same green color; the canopies will be a dark bronze finish; the canopies will be a similar color. On the non-primary facades, they are taking a swath of masonry off and will remove a non-compliant fire escape; a new exit stairway will be built within the building. The façade will be flushed out, a new stucco system will go on, and paint will be similar to what is there now. Metal clad wood double hung window system will be installed replacing circa 1950-1960 windows. The windows on the westernmost façade will be slightly reconfigured; they will use the same head and sill heights but the windows will be a little bit wider.

Mr. Veith asked Mr. Chatfield to clarify the size of the canopies.

Mr. Chatfield said all the bays on the Pike Street façade will be 10' deep versus 8' deep. The retail required minimum is 8' but since they propose to remove bus shelters on Pike Street the required minimum is increased to 10'.

Mr. Veith asked about the rooftop equipment.

Mr. Chatfield directed the Board to the updated roof plan and explained the new rooftop equipment. They plan to remove the generator to the lower roof and on the upper roof, 30' back they will add some pumps, a cooling tower, small mechanical unit, stair penthouse; with the new cornice line it would not be visible.

Mr. Abelsen asked Ms. Woo for information on the stone cotta.

Ms. Woo said the Certificate of Approval was given for that in 1990 so detail should be in the file. There is a slight color to the stone cotta.

Mr. Chatfield said the last thing they want to do is take everything apart and have it break. His understanding is that stone cotta was the 18 years ago equivalent of PGRG.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Finrow asked what ARC's view was.

Mr. Lee reported that the ARC thought it was great.

Mr. Abelsen thought it was well done, thoughtful and focusing on the historical properties of the building and removing those things that don't contribute to that.

Mr. Finrow asked if there was any discussion about the canopies.

Mr. Abelsen said it is a very modern structure but because it is close to the street he didn't have any objections to it.

Ms. Sodt said it would not be attached to the terracotta; it would be attached to the storefront system.

Mr. Finrow noted there were no canopies on the original storefronts.

Ms. Howard thought it getting rid of the bus shelters was a huge advantage and that she really liked the choice of bronze color for the canopies.

Ms. Conti agreed that it would be a big improvement.

Ms. Tremaine liked the inside stairway.

Mr. Veith noted for the record that the cornice was being added back; typically mimicking is frowned on but in this case they are replicating as near as possible a previously existing component so it falls well within the bounds of the Standards.

Mr. Abelsen agreed that it is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards. He added the Board would be interested to see what they come up with on the cornice.

Mr. Chatfield said he would provide engineering shop drawings to the Board for review.

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 exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report 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* and the proposed design of the replacement of the missing cornice has been substantiated by pictorial evidence, as per Standard #6 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/RM 10:0:0 Motion Approved.

061808.23

Seattle Japanese Garden
1075 Lake Washington Blvd. E

Ms. Chave said the proposed changes are for entry alterations including new entry gate and ticketing facility, meeting room/staff building, and associated landscaping alterations.

Applicant comments:

Kelly Goold, Seattle Parks, introduced Will Scales and Bob Hoshide, project architects.

Will Scales, using a model, oriented the Board to the site. He said currently there is a small ticket booth, a small gate, a notice board, and some Sani-Cans. They propose a stucco wall across the front then breaks it and pulls it apart and creates within that a cluster of small buildings. The three main components are the ticket booth; a future gift shop area; and a small meeting room, restrooms and maintenance. Overall the size of the building is 1300 square feet. The primary entrance is a ceremonial metal gate; it is a wood framed structure with stucco; the rest of the siding is vertical board cedar; there is a metal roofing shingle; and trellis work.

Bob Hoshide said the existing gate structure will be relocated to Kubota Gardens. He said the character of the proposed buildings is they take a lot of their finishes and form from the existing tea house building. The gate itself is proposed to be a bronze gate done by an artist; the idea is that it would be an open gate that one could see through. The sliding gates would secure the garden during the off hours and when open will slide open and while against the solid walls will still be a design feature. He said that Jerry Tsutakawa will do the gates; his father, George, did the gates that are now at the grand visitor center at the other end of the Arboretum. He said that the design is subtle; it is a bronze fabrication that has diamond shaped bars that go across the gate and are tapered.

Kenichi Nakano, landscape architect, said the front courtyard design is really to complement the architecture and is very functional; they did not want the courtyard

to compete with the garden. There will be granite pavement; there will be a small wall where one could sit and wait for the bus or a taxi. Another small wall will have flags during festival times. He said the plant material complements what is out there; it is a clean and simple courtyard design.

Mr. Scales provided samples of proposed materials. He said the cedar board siding would be stained the darker of the color samples and the posts and trellises would get the lighter stain. The metal roof shingle will be the slate color.

Mr. Lee asked why they were not using a copper roof.

Mr. Hoshide said the existing teahouse has a copper roof and initially they liked the idea of doing another copper roof but concern was raised both within the Parks Department and comments at the Design Commission about the use of copper and problems with runoff and leeching into the soil. They then looked at painted steel shingle to get a similar color and same texture.

Mr. Abelsen asked what the thought process was on the selection on the stains as opposed to a clear finish.

Mr. Hoshidai said the stain colors are similar to what is on the teahouse; they tried to match that as closely as possible. The teahouse is a semi-transparent stain and has weathered; this will be a more solid body stain to protect the wood.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the ridge detail as it was not included in the package.

Mr. Hoshide said there is a ridge detail and it is like the existing gate and teahouse; there are two end caps and an end piece.

Mr. Abelsen stated it needed to be included in the scope.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee said it is gorgeous proposal.

Ms. Howard thought it would be a huge improvement over the existing condition.

Ms. Conti said the gate is gorgeous and she is glad it will be open to provide visibility even when the garden is closed. She is glad they are addressing the copper issue and is glad they were able to retain the textural feel; she said the applicant has been thoughtful and this is a gorgeous project.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed entry alterations including new entry gate and ticketing facility, meeting room/staff building, and associated landscaping alterations. This action is based on the following:

The proposed work meets the following Standard of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

Standard #9 New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing size scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and the environment.

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

MM/SC/MS/VA 10:00 Motion approved.

061808.24

Hamilton Middle School

1610 N. 41st St.

Modification of the vertical wall at the west side of the playground to a series of stepped retaining walls.

Mr. Veith recused himself.

Don Gillmore, Seattle School District, explained the proposal. He said the School District was approached by DPD and asked to soften the eastern edge of the playground; previously they had a wall and transformer room, generator and storage rooms and the wall went straight up with the playground on top. He said DPD asked them to soften the edge. They moved the transformer and generator to the interior of the building and now have a stepped planter bed on that edge. The loading dock is still in the same place and the doors have not changed but now there are a series of concrete planters that step up and go back about 45 degrees. A stairway was added as well.

Mr. Lee asked the applicant to clarify the proposal using the presentation board.

Mr. Gillmore showed where the vertical wall was previously proposed and where now the series of stepped back walls will be and said the planters will have plants cascading over the edges. He said the terraces will be about 5'.

Mr. Abelsen asked if there would be a review of plant choices.

Ms. Chave said her understanding was that plant choices hadn't been made yet; it is something that could be deferred to ARC.

Mr. Abelsen said if the idea was to soften the edges, some changes have been made by the applicants but concrete is still hard and the softening effect is dependent on the type of plantings.

Mr. Gillmore said their intent is to have something that would cascade over and something else that would grow up because the 5' is wide enough that they can get something in there that would grow vertically. They are currently working with the Parks Department on the remainder of the property so they want to tie in to what is already being done.

Ms. Chave asked if the landscape choices were waiting on negotiation with Parks Department.

Mr. Gillmore said yes, that they didn't want to do something different from what Parks was doing and wanted the two to tie together. With 5' he said they have the advantage of being able to do whatever they want, even trees.

Mr. Lee said the general north elevation shows bigger steps and differs from the section detail.

Mr. Gillmore explained at the north wall of the building the wall wraps the steps; it is also subject to negotiation with the Parks Department.

Mr. Finrow asked if a handrail is proposed.

Mr. Gillmore said there would be at the top.

Public Comment:

Mr. Lee stated only the wall was being reviewed, and that the public comment should be directed at what is under consideration in the application under review today (the wall)

Greg Flood, school neighbor, handed out copies of an email he sent. He was glad the area would be terraced and thought it would help the west wall. He asked the Board to revisit the Certificate of Approval for the gymnasium because its modern style does not fit in with the neighborhood.

Mr. Lee said only the wall was being reviewed.

Mr. Flood said he knew the Board has revisited decisions on other projects.

Mr. Lee reiterated that only the wall was being reviewed.

Mr. Flood said they felt they hadn't been heard.

Mr. Lee stated the Board had listened and understood his concerns; the Board voted on what was presented by the applicant within the rules the Board is subject to and today just the wall is being reviewed.

Mr. Flood said he didn't have a problem with the wall but the neighborhood had a problem with the gym.

Peter Sohn said a lot of people are upset about the design and he doesn't understand why the School Board has designed something that is so at odds with the neighborhood and existing school. He said there is no reason the gymnasium has to look like that; if it had looked more like the rest of the school 95% of the opposition that has been generated wouldn't have occurred.

Mr. Lee said the Board tries to work with owners and community to achieve useful rehabilitation of historic buildings.

Vince Lyons, school neighbor, said if one is looking at the wall on Densmore it is good they are terracing and he encourage the applicant to do something beyond plain concrete like a community art project. He said the corner of the park at the western street has a swirling spiral made in the sidewalk as it leads up into the park; it would be good to pick up on something like that and have some continuity to the past. He said he is the manager of the Design Review Board for the City and was a zoning planning examiner and worked on TOPS; at that time the landmark there brought in a good historic architect, they looked at it and did an appropriate roof. He said based on Mr. Lee's statement it can't be revisited but he said he thought there were alternatives that are viable; he encouraged looking at the wall as an opportunity to do more than just terracing and landscaping an infill/backfill playground. He said they deserve more than concrete and plants.

Mr. Abelsen agreed with Mr. Lyons that detailing of the concrete would be a good opportunity to go a bit further; if the applicant is supportive of that they can come back to ARC to review those.

Ms. Chave asked if Mr. Abelsen wanted the landscaping referred to ARC.

Mr. Abelsen said definitely.

Ms. Chave said the motion should be modified to address that.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the of the proposed vertical wall at the west side of the playground to a series of stepped retaining walls, as described in the application submittal and submitted plans with a recommendation that detailing be considered by the applicant for review and approval by the ARC, and to provide planting and specifications for plantings to the ARC for review and approval. This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to *SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Report on Designation:* The exterior of the landmark school and the significant interior features will not be adversely affected by the proposed modification to the vertical wall at the west side of the playground.
2. *With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner:* The proposed modification to the vertical wall at the west side of the playground is reasonable.
3. The other factors of SMC 25.12 .750 are not applicable to this application.

The proposed modification to the vertical wall at the west side of the playground meets the following Standard of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

Standard #9 New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing size scale and

architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and the environment.

MM/SC/VA/CH 8:1:1 Motion Approved.
Ms. Tremaine opposed; Mr. Veith recused himself.

061808.4 NOMINATIONS

061808.41 Coca Cola Bottling Plant
1313 East Columbia Street

Sari Graven, Director of Facilities, Seattle University, introduced Tom Walsh, Foster Pepper Law firm and Susan Boyle, BOLA Architects.

Mr. Walsh stated Seattle University purchased the building in 2007 and is planning to use it for institutional purposes and is going to be seeking approval to make changes to the exterior including changes to the windows and the paint so need to know if it is a landmark. He said architect for the project, Stephen Yamada Heidner, was here if the Board has questions.

Ms. Boyle presented the nomination. She said the building is located in the Squire Park area, located between First Hill and Capitol Hill. The neighborhood was originally settled by many Jewish families beginning in the 1880s. The site is in a swale between two ridges of the hills; the residential occurred more up the hills. The Pacific School and a YMCA were built nearby as well as a streetcar garage.

Ms. Boyle said Coca Cola is associated this building; beginning with the invention of Coca Cola in 1896 and the company's growth of 4000% by 1900. Beverages such as Coca Cola became more popular during the early 20th Century particularly during prohibition. Coca Cola Company invented masterful business making the product and marketing it through local bottling plants which got the secret formula and made and distributed it. By 1950 there were 11,000 plants throughout the US. During World War II the company made impressive market relations with the US Military providing beverages for hygiene purposes to military personnel in foreign countries and to also build up their perceived resulting market after the war. Early Seattle beverage plants were located in So. Lake Union, Georgetown, South Seattle; some of the same areas as the breweries; Squire Park also had a Canada Dry bottling plant.

Ms. Boyle explained the "Pop Deco Streamline Moderne" style (term from a book by Brooker). The prominent northeast corner of the building shows the curving corner, banding, emphasis on horizontality, subtle sculptural mass of the concrete walls as they come forward at the entry, the placement of the windows within localized symmetry on the facades and the correspondence between the windows and the banding.

Ms. Boyle said the building was constructed in 1939 and provided photos showing the building's monochromatic color scheme, the primary north entry, and the stair tower. The building is composed of two components: the two story L-shape around the bottling room which is behind it in a one story area and there is a service vehicle area in the one story portion on the south side. Typical houses in the area date from

around 1900; most are single family although there is a mix of low scale apartments and multifamily. Seattle University's origins are in this neighborhood; it began when a group of Jesuits purchased nine lots in 1890. Original drawings show offices housed in the lower bay. The entry has glass block infill with semi circular canopy with rick rack detail and porthole window.

Ms. Boyle said the site size is 175' x 360', 62,000 square feet and the building itself is about 46,200 square feet. The primary north façade with the main entry show some changes to the original doors. Three openings on the first floor have been infilled; the center one was cute to be a larger opening with a vehicle door that leads into the former bottling plant. This work was done by Qwest. The east façade has a much simpler composition and use of materials, straightforward windows, the massing of the building is less dimensional. The detailing carries around the corner and it is clear the south and the west facades are plainer materials and composition wise. The west has projecting carport elements that were added by Qwest. Except for the two story massing it is very plain functional building.

Ms. Boyle showed detailed views of the stairtower. She said one typically thinks of Art Deco as being made up of richer materials, seriousness and highly decorative qualities; when getting into the streamlined moderne, one sees things that are still sculptural but with less expensive materials. Ms. Boyle described most of the interior as being "mid-20th Century" though there is one small section with wood paneling, doors, transoms and relites but only in a small portion of the hallway and in two offices. The volumes of the building from floor to ceiling are consistent with the original building but the finishes are entirely new. The garage and bottling room are utilitarian structures. Coca Cola embraced this style and with the assistance of design architect Jessie Shelton built another similar building in Portland around the same time.

Ms. Boyle commented on the Ordinance designation criteria and said it doesn't appear the building was associated with any specific historic event or person so does not meet Criteria A or B. The building is associated with the development of the Squire Park neighborhood as one of the light industrial buildings built there in the 1920s and 1930s but Coca Cola's history isn't really tied to Squire Park so it doesn't meet Criterion C. The building is an intact example of Modern Style architectures so does meet Criterion D. The relationship between Jessie Shelton and John Graham is unknown but it is thought it was a typical relationship between a design architect and a locally registered architect who saw the building through the construction phase. While there was a clear collaboration between the two, Ms. Boyle said it is difficult to determine who did what. The building is located on a sizeable lot and its visual features contrast with residential buildings that surround it so Criterion F would be one for consideration.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen said with regard to Ms. Boyle's comments about the architect, because the style was so persistent for a broad range of years, it seems like Shelton would be the more dominant of the two architects.

Ms. Boyle stated that John Graham was virtuosic in what he could do and she thinks of his work as having more refinement; she knows his work better because he was a

local architect. Jessie Shelton primarily designed these bottling plants; if that is the case he probably was the more defining member of the design team.

Mr. Veith said he noted on page 6 of Ms. Boyle's report that the Coca Cola created an innovative method for manufacturing, distributing and marketing a product on a national scale" and "that methodology is embodied in the design for the original building which was constructed by the Coca Cola Bottling Company in 1939". He expected a discussion about how the plant worked.

Ms. Boyle said she meant it more generally and what she was trying to get at was they would deliver the syrup and so the manufacturing was a pretty simple process. The drawings she has seen do not indicate equipment.

Mr. Veith asked if the CMU structure was separate or if it was all one structure.

Ms. Boyle said it is all one building with two very clear components; there are drawings in the back of the nomination that show the whole building on the site. The southern 3/5 of the building was for vehicles.

Mr. Finrow asked where this building fit in with quality association of other Deco buildings and how Ms. Boyle would characterize this building.

Ms. Boyle said there are other buildings of this style primarily on E. Marginal Way and Elliott Ave; those streets developed for industrial uses when the style came. It is a depression era style, akin to the Penthouse Theater on the UW grounds; a little plywood clad building with wings. The minimalism of this style has to do with the overall economy; she wouldn't judge this building with refinement as one of her criteria; this building is not outstanding but ho-hum either.

Mr. Finrow asked if on the north façade where garage door was put in, if there could have been big windows where people could have watched the bottles going by.

Ms. Boyle said they haven't found photos to indicate that.

Mr. Finrow asked if the boarded up areas on the façade used to be windows and if there used to be a window where now a doors goes through.

Ms. Boyle concurred; she thought they were divided light glass originally. They did include one of the drawings that show large simple divided windows.

Mr. Veith stated the report suggested the windows were used in that way.

Ms. Boyle said they were secretive about their ingredients but shrewd about promotion and using imagery.

Mr. Finrow asked Ms. Boyle again assessing the quality of this building as an example.

Ms. Boyle said it is example; she didn't want to characterize it as an outstanding building.

Mr. Finrow added it is a good illustration of the style.

Ms. Boyle agreed it was.

Public Comment:

Bill Zosal delivered a letter from the Squire Park Community Council; he said the building is distinctive in the neighborhood and much admired. He said the neighborhood doesn't have a lot of historic landmarks and they strongly support the preservation of this building.

Eugenia Woo reported that DOCOMOMOWEWA supported the nomination of this building; it is a landmark quality building.

Mimi Sheridan thought it a wonderful building; she said Canada Dry is still there. It is the Seattle University Bookstore; the main façade is intact. She said online there is a detailed report about the Canada Dry plants and addresses questions about the process.

David Neth, neighbor, was ecstatic to hear the building was being nominated. His building and most of the structures on that block are circa 1910-1915. He enjoys the contrast of this building to the neighborhood and thinks that what makes it more outstanding; it stands by itself.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said he had been surveying houses in that area and discovered this building by accident; he advised other Board members to drive by the building because in person the quality is more evident. It has been modified with the canopy and ramp additions and the painting but when one gets up closer to the north end one becomes more aware of the nice example of the style. He agreed with Ms. Boyle's characterization that the building is not outstanding but a nice job and it has a presence; it is not singular but one of only a few examples in the City. Mr. Veith supported nomination.

Ms. Howard agreed with Mr. Veith and stated the building had a quality and presence that don't come through in the photographs. Ms. Howard agreed with the Staff Report.

Ms. Chave stated there may be other Criteria, such as F that can be considered.

Ms. Conti supported the nomination on D and F.

Mr. Finrow supported nomination and thought it a terrific little building.

Ms. Nicolas supported nomination and said it was a good addition to the neighborhood.

Ms. Strong has been familiar with this building since childhood and stated she has always been captivated by the whimsical little door with the scalloped detail. She supported nomination.

Mr. Abelsen supported nomination but thought it unfortunate that there had been alterations but they don't detract from the significance of the building's character. He stated he thought there are other Criteria this building could fit into and that there could be historical significance in being a Coca Cola Bottling plant.

Mr. Martinson supported nomination and that other Criteria may support designation.

Ms. Tremaine supported nomination as a fun example of Streamline Moderne based on D and E; it is a nice building that adds to the diversity of the architecture of the City.

Mr. Lee supported nomination; it is a lovely building with remarkable integrity. It is a fine example of this style of architecture and probably qualifies for Criteria F as well.

Action: I move approval of the Coca Cola Bottling Plant at 1313 E. Columbia St. for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building and the site; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for August 6, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

Mr. Martinson left at 5:37 PM.

061808.42

Cinerama
2100 Fourth Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained this is a category 1 building in the Downtown survey and introduced Mimi Sheridan who would present on the City's behalf followed by a presentation by Larry Johnson on behalf of the owner.

Mimi Sheridan reported this building is not an architectural wonder but one whose interest lies in its context and stories. It sits at the southeast edge of Belltown. In the 1920s there were a lot of garages in the area and in photos taken just a couple years ago many parking lots are shown in the vicinity. The area around the building is a mix of new and old buildings.

Ms. Sheridan said movies and the theater has always been important in Seattle from the earliest times. There were many theaters from the early days; movies started here around 1902 mostly as part of Vaudeville presentations. The first of the great picture palaces was the Coliseum which was built in 1916; it is now the Banana Republic retail store. There were a lot of smaller theaters Downtown also. The Wintergarden still exists but has been greatly altered and is now the Aaron Brothers Art & Framing store. Downtown was full of a number of grand picture palaces as well as some smaller theaters; there were small theaters in every neighborhood. By the 1940s there were more than 50 theaters in the Seattle area. Movies did well during the Depression and the War but after the war the focus of Downtown business was to compete with the suburbs and on making Downtown more accessible by auto. There

were no movie theaters built Downtown during this period; there were theaters built at Northgate and South Center and Bellevue.

The Martin Cinerama was built in 1963 and was the first Downtown theater built in 29 years. Belltown was the perfect place for auto-oriented development because it had a lot of parking lots. It had a very simple suburban style adjacent parking; it didn't attract people with its architectural style. In the following years two other theaters were built nearby. The Cinerama was designed to provide an overwhelming theatrical experience that would involve people and compete with TV.

Cinerama was developed in 1939 with 11 cameras at the New York World's Fair; it was used during the war for fighter pilot training. The process evolved to three 35 mm cameras and movies were shown with three projectors on a massive curved screen of vertical louvered strips with 7-track sound. It was very expensive with many technical glitches. Only seven films were made using the Cinerama process. About 200 theaters were equipped to show Cinerama films and only ten were built specifically for this purpose; this theater being one of the ten. Cinerama came to Seattle in 1956 and the Paramount Theater was retrofitted on a temporary basis to accommodate a traveling show; about 1/3 of the seats were taken out of the Paramount to make room for the equipment. Two films were shown for 1 ½ years. At the Seattle World's Fair there was a big feature at the Boeing Spacearium called Cinerama which used mirrors rather than the Cinerama process.

Martin was a good sized chain in the Southeast that had a contract with Cinerama to build ten new theaters and remodel 100; only five of the theaters were built. Most of the purpose-built Cinerama theaters were built by Martin or another company called Cooper; most were in the south. Seattle was targeted for a theater because of the World's Fair and they picked a site close to the monorail.

The architects were Finch, Alexander, Barnes, Rothschild, Paschael, (FABRP) specialized in designing these Cinerama theaters for Martin and doing the retrofits; they design Martin Cinemas in St. Louis, San Francisco, New Orleans, and Seattle. They also were the Coca Cola architect and did the Coca Cola office buildings in Atlanta. This building was attributed to Raymond Peck who was the local architect but Ms. Sheridan said FABRP likely did the important design work. Peck worked on Temple de Hirsch Sinai.

The Cinerama opened in January 1963; it was a luxurious theater with 826 seats, large screen and high quality sound system, things which weren't seen in the suburban theaters. It started out running two Cinerama films until 1965 and then it switched to regular wide screen films. It was purchased by Sterling in the 1960s and acquired by a national chain in the 1980s and went downhill until purchased by Paul Allen and renovated.

The building is a simple 120 square foot box; it is constructed of concrete and steel and faced with light gray brick with large expanses of blue mosaic tile along the front. Display cases and a marquee were later additions. Originally the main entrance was on 4th and Lenora but that was gradually shifted to the other entrance on the southeast corner near the parking lot. In the renovation it received new doors. There is a heavy use of stainless steel on all the exteriors. The 1999 renovation was extensive with seismic reinforcement and mechanical and electrical upgrades; the

sound and project equipment were replaced; a new marquee and blade signs and poster display cases were installed.

Ms. Sheridan showed photos of the interior and said the lobby was constructed with not much of a concession stand; one was added years later. The renovated interior has a 1960s space age-inspired décor but is not the same as what it was before. The floor was changed to make one entrance ADA accessible. The basic configuration of the lobby and auditorium remain the same; the seats were rebuilt and recovered in the same color; new wall and ceiling treatments were added; a new movie screen and new Cinerama screen were added. There is original Cinerama equipment in the three booths but it has been restored.

Ms. Sheridan said despite being updated the Cinerama has the ability to convey its significance. Criterion C is the most appropriate because it was connected with the World's Fair and the image of Seattle; it was also associated with suburbanization and the auto-oriented development; and it is associated with film history. Movies have been a significant part of Seattle's cultural heritage since the early 20th century. The Cinerama is associated in a significant way with this history as the only local theater and one of the only in the entire country that was built to exhibit Cinerama films.

Board Questions:

Ms. Strong asked if the aqua blue mosaic was original.

Ms. Sheridan said yes she thought they were.

Brandon Morgan, owner's representative, Vulcan Real Estate, said he talked with the Vulcan team who worked on the renovation. The Cinerama format was exhibited in the theater only a short time – about six months – and only two films were exhibited. Only a couple films survive today but they are in very poor condition. The equipment in the theater is from the 1950s but is not original to the theater; it was purchased from Peru in 1999. The screen is new and was made for widescreen films including 70 mm films that are regularly shown. Cinerama films cannot be exhibited on that screen, the Cinerama screen has to be taken out of storage and it takes two days to install the louvered screen; they've have done it twice.

Susan Boyle, BOLA Architects, reiterated Ms. Sheridan's historical overview of theaters in Seattle and the Martin Cinerama theaters. The high point was in 1946 when 90 million Americans went to the movie each week; after the way attendance plummeted due to competition with TV and recreation. Cinerama was a difficult type of film to make; only seven movies were made between 1952 and 1957.

Ms. Boyle said this was a simple reductive Functionalist Modern building. She said one of the blade signs existed before they did the work in 1999 and the second one was added. The imagery on the blade signs is provided by permission from the copywrite holder. When the Cinerama opened it just had the readerboard but was also decorated using uplighting in a scalloped effect; they also had digital movie posters showing running clips of movies.

Ms. Boyle described some of the changes to the outside. The original entrance was on the alley side; it is now an infill panel. The ticket booth was moved to the south side where there is an entry. The renovations were very well designed and sympathetic but not consistent; it is much more refined than the original building in terms of the detailing and the way the stainless steel is used on the automated ticket dispensers and the enclosure. In 1999 the floor throughout the lobby was lowered for ADA accessibility.

Mr. Morgan explained the interior mosaic is new, the exterior mosaic tile is original.

Ms. Boyle said because the floor level was dropped the stairs were changed to bring one up to the auditorium. The ceiling is wavy; the undulations are computer designed acoustic aids; the wall panels on the sides are also designed for their acoustic properties. The seats are original and were laid out differently to allow for central aisle. All the interior lighting is different. There are 24 speakers now rather than 8.

With regard to the Criteria, Ms. Boyle said the building did not meet Criterion A; it is not significantly associated with the development of Belltown or with the World's Fair; it has the same general associations as many other buildings do. It is representative of suburban development but it doesn't go beyond that association with that aspect of history. It doesn't meet Criterion B as it is associated with the Cinerama technology with Fred Waller, who was the inventor; but his contributions were to the industry and not to the City, State or Nation. There were only seven Cinerama films. Ms. Boyle said the theater is related to advancement in film projection technologies but this association is not a significant aspect of the City, State, or Nation's cultural heritage because Cinerama was so limited. By the time other wide screen movies were being shown they were shown at other theaters. With regard to Criterion D, Ms. Boyle said the building embodies visible characteristics of the Modern Style with its concrete frame, marble crete and mosaic tile cladding but they are not distinctive features. Most of the distinctive features date from the recent remodels including: the multiple blade signs, the LED exterior lighting, the stainless steel ticket booths, the expansive marquee, the signage and display panels and on the interior, the lobby space, concessions stand, undulating auditorium ceiling and celestial lighting. The building's original design is so simple it almost seems to lack distinctive character.

Ms. Boyle said while the current features might initially appear Modern, they are the result of a "Retro" design which should not be confused with an authentic effort of restoration. Ms. Boyle reported she does not consider the building an outstanding work of a designer or builder.

Board Questions: None.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, spoke on behalf of baby boomers who grew up in Seattle and supported nomination

Eugenia Woo, Docomomo Wewa, said the changes in renovation were done to enhance the sound quality and acoustics. They believe the building meets Criteria C and F, definitely for the film technology and film history. Just because Cinerama technology was only around for a couple years doesn't diminish its significance. She said it meets F because it is a distinctive building in the area.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Finrow said he was ambivalent; he liked the building in terms of its utilitarian architectural expression. He agreed that Criterion C makes sense. He remembered the World's Fair and the Cinerama. He said buildings from this era are subject to being devalued because of their simplicity and utilitarian quality. He supported nomination.

Ms. Conti was not sure it meets the minimum threshold of being obvious and was interested in what the other Board members have to say.

Ms. Howard wanted to hear what other Board members have to say. She thought C would be the right Criterion; she struggled with what ways, if any, the changes to the building affect its integrity for Criterion C.

Mr. Veith said he was leaning toward not nominating the building. The box does have a real elegance to it. He went to the theater once in the 1970s and didn't see a Cinerama movie, but the combination of the very minimal box and the very minimal interior was what made it work. He said that with the interior modified it becomes just the box frame and he wasn't sure that is enough. He appreciated the elegance of the box, it has become so detached from its original completeness; it is incomplete without its elegant interior and doesn't think it is a landmark quality building.

Ms. Nicolas echoed Mr. Veith; the renovations are wonderful but don't voice the original building. She doesn't support nomination.

Ms. Strong did not support nomination because the renovations have taken away the original integrity of the building.

Mr. Abelsen appreciated Mr. Finrow's comments but does not support nomination. The renovations in 1999 make it significantly different from the original design intent. The overall form has its own statement; the interior renovations have changed the volumetric aspect. The building is distinctive unto itself. If the Board were to nominate, C would be the only appropriate Criterion.

Ms. Tremaine said she thought she would be sorry if the building isn't saved and supported nomination.

Mr. Lee did not support nomination as the building is not significant enough. The changes inside have been significant and well done. The building doesn't rise to the level of significance; it is not obvious.

Ms. Howard thought the building would be significant but said it is an integrity issue and the building does not convey its significance.

Ms. Conti said no.

Mr. Finrow said the characteristic of utilitarian buildings is they can be rebuilt; the interior can be completely restored at some point in the future. The architecture of utilitarian boxes has a certain neutral quality that allows different kinds of uses to pass through it through time and in a certain way is universal. He thought the building worth saving but understood the interior is gone but as a utilitarian box, the building has integrity.

Mr. Abelsen said as it is utilitarian, if the signage was removed, what it would represent.

Mr. Finrow thought that a good point; signage and marquee are an important part of identifying what it is. If the signage on the exterior were changed significantly it might erode its integrity further. The building is a vanishing breed that can take a variety of uses and has a certain value in that regard.

Mr. Abelsen said it is a difficult argument.

Ms. Conti said she is a fan of utilitarian but there really isn't much there on the exterior without the signage and the interior has been radically altered. It appears that much of what makes the Cinerama the Cinerama has been brought back in after the fact from Peru.

Mr. Veith said if one just looks at the box; it is an elegant box. The interior was an important characteristic in how one appreciated the structure. It is an unusually nice box and elegant in a mathematical sense; it is as simple as you can be and still be architecture. He thought it was missing a big component.

Mr. Abelsen concurred in regard to the mathematical elegance of it; the form unto itself is great and there is a good comparison to be made between the older theaters that not only invited you from outside with the lights and elegance of detail and when you went inside that was repeated. With this building none of that is evident with the exterior; marble crete and the use of tile don't help.

Ms. Conti stated the interior now detracts from the original elegance.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Cinerama Theater at 2100 Fourth Avenue as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/TV/CH 7:2:0 Motion approved.
Ms. Tremaine and Mr. Finrow opposed.

061808.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

061808.51 Bon Marche Stables
2315 Western Avenue

Ms. Sodt reported the owners requested a sixty 60 extension; they sent materials regarding economic analysis and time is needed to review it.

Action: I move to give the Bon Marche Stables a 60 day extension.

MM/SC/MT/CH 9:0:0 Motion approved.

061808.52 Women's University Club
1105 Sixth Avenue

Ms. Sodt reported the Controls Agreement was signed by the Women's University Club; the Agreement is pretty basic and the items that are specific to the building are under Administrative Review: HVAC and mechanical systems; the Club wishes to paint existing ducting to match existing brick; the Club may want to replace the existing awning to reveal windows that are currently covered; the Club wants to put up a plaque identifying the building as a landmark (will be installed in the mortar joints); and someday the Club may want to infill existing light well in order to expand their class room space and since it would be somewhat visible this would be a staff review. Staff can always require Board review for administratively reviewed items if the proposed changes are more extreme than anticipated.

Public Comment:

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, said the Women's University Club contacted the Queen Anne Historical Society as they were interested in putting a plaque up. Ms. Eggleston said it is a great building and is proud it was landmarked; there is integrity there and she thinks they may want to go on the National Register.

I move to approve the Controls and Incentives Agreement for the Women's University Club.

MM/SC.CH/VA 9:0:0 Motion approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator