



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 318/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, June 4, 2008– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Melinda Bloom
Rebecca Frestedt

Absent

Ron Martinson
Alyce Conti

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

060408.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 16, 2008

Mr. Finrow arrived at 3:36 PM.

MM/SC/MH/MT 9:0:1 Minutes approved as corrected. Mr. Finrow abstained.

060408.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

060408.21 Columbia City Gallery
4864 Rainier Ave. S.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Ms. Frestedt described the proposed modification to existing blade sign. This is a proposal to add an 8.5”h x 47”w aluminum panel to the bottom of the existing blade sign. She said the panel will read “Custom Picture Framing” and will be welded to an aluminum mounting plate attached to the bottom of the existing sign. The colors will be matched to the existing sign. She distributed drawings and photographs. She said the existing blade sign received Board approval in May 2007. She noted that the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the proposal and recommended approval on May 16, 2008. Ms. Frestedt said that she was presenting the proposal on behalf of the applicant, Justen Cimino, who was unable to attend. She introduced two members of the Columbia City Review Committee, Ann Beeman and Pete Lamb.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the sample provided matched the existing.

Ms. Frestedt concurred that it would.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board determined it had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed signage modification. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

Relevant Design Guidelines

11. Signs. All signs on or hanging from buildings shall be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the other signs and other buildings in the District.

b. Blade signs. Blade signs that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

MM/SC/MH/TV

10:0:0 Motion approved.

060408.22

3815 S. Angeline St.
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Ms. Frestedt described the proposed demolition, and preliminary design for new construction of twelve townhomes. She provided relevant background information

on the project. She distributed a chronology of the project and its review before the Columbia City Review Committee (CCRC) and Architectural Review Committee (ARC). She summarized feedback from both committees and the changes that have been made to the project in response to committee concerns. She said that both committees expressed concerns that the garden windows on the East and West facades seemed unintegrated into the design. She said that members of the CCRC did not reach a consensus on their final recommendation to the Board. Exhibits provided include presentation materials and two corresponding permit sets of drawings associated with this project. Ms. Frestedt introduced the applicants.

Application Comment:

Michael Hoffman, HdLT Architects, said the most significant change was the elimination of the roof decks. He said they choose to eliminate the penthouse decks and simplify the project in response to Committee concerns. He said the roofs are a bit deeper, with increased overhangs. He said they also made minor changes on the depth of the side bay. He said they added bike parking and a fence at the drive aisle to reduce glare. He said that privacy screening is required by code. He said that they eliminated a small roof located over the decks because it did not meet code for modulation. They tried to integrate a two-story bay on the East and West facades, but it was not compliant on side yards. He said the Code limited the height of the bay windows and that the height had been reduced to meet the Code. They added downspouts, corner boards and rockeries. He said they have taken extensive photos of neighboring buildings and studied traditional projects as well as looking at some of the more current, modern projects that are within the District. He said he feels the current proposal responds to the requirements of maintaining historical character in a modern building type.

Kate Driscoll said there were initially 5 – 6 different schemes for the site plan. They eliminated the penthouse because this is more in line with what the committee would approve.

Mr. Hoffman said they plan to retain the existing rockery walls. He also addressed concerns about the grade. The structure is below the grade of the alley; there is about a 30 degree angle down to soil at the building.

Ms. Beeman expressed concern about the alley and the grade difference to the units. She asked the applicant if he had a drawing that showed the grade difference.

Ms. Driscoll directed the Board to sheet 10B in the packet and showed the relationship of the grade along the alley.

Ms. Frestedt reminded the Board the application was for preliminary design, height, massing and scale and that material, landscaping and color details would be addressed later.

There was discussion about the height of the proposed project in relationship to the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Hoffman showed the contributing corner home and that the new construction will be taller. He stated the grade of the alley is higher than the base of the project.

Mr. Finrow asked if there was a fence along the alley to prevent cars from driving into that yard.

Ms. Driscoll said there is protection and directed the Board to a photograph of the alley. She said there is existing rockery which would deter traffic.

Mr. Veith asked if they had a drawing that shows the height difference between the new building and the adjacent building to the east. He asked what the height at the peak of his building at the east end is.

Mr. Hoffman said the building is 34' 9" high from existing grade which is about 5' below neighboring property grade. He said the adjacent building must be around 24' high with that roof pitch; they are about 5' taller and probably pretty close to the same height as the front facing gable. He said the peak of the adjacent home is positioned in the middle of the proposed buildings.

Mr. Lee asked if the proposal fits within the zoning envelope.

Mr. Hoffman said it does.

Mr. Veith asked about the staging of the project, since the construction drawings do not include all four buildings.

Ms. Driscoll said there area two permit sets; one for each side.

Mr. Veith asked if both were in for permitting now.

Mr. Hoffman said they will both be built simultaneously but on two lots which is common multi-family zoning for townhomes. They are being presented together because they will essentially have a community impact as one development.

Public Comment:

Ron Mohn, Columbia City property owner, said the purpose and intent of CCRC guidelines was to enhance the District's architecture and historic heritage, improve aesthetic value and to promote a local identity of the District. He said to achieve these purposes a new building should be distinctive. He said this one lacks distinction and is just another infill townhouse project that could go anywhere. Referring back to Guidelines and principals, he said it does not enhance the District's architectural and historic heritage; it does not improve aesthetic value and it fails to promote the District's identity. He asked the Board to deny the request until a distinctive design is presented that contributes to this District.

Monson Tsang, who represented the project development group, said the goal has been to build something that adds value and is distinctive that the Board can embrace. He said they wanted a more modern design and to provide amenities such as roof top decks. He said the Columbia City Review Committee supported the previous design but that DPD would not allow certain aspects of the project, such as the height of the penthouse roofs, due to existing zoning. He said they have gone back and forth with the CCRC numerous times. Their goal is to provide something that fits in the historical realm and is distinct, that will bring a certain demographic into the District.

He said they've gone through seven revisions and spent much money over a year and they are willing to what they need to do to satisfy the Board.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Beeman said they have seen the design numerous times and that the initial focus was on the roofline. She said the project is a fairly common townhouse prototype. She said in terms of its acceptability in the neighborhood the relationship to the alley is important. She said she is concerned about the feeling of the alley passage and deep recessed entries. She said the end elevations don't feel entirely integrated. She said she appreciated the simplification of the roofline, but does think the design is unique and is disappointed.

Mr. Lee said the design needs to fit within the Guidelines.

Mr. Lamb said he is not fond of the design, but stated that it meets the guidelines. He is happy with the changes that have been made to relate the project to the alley. He also said the scale of the project is improved with the elimination of the penthouses. He explained he had three or four major concerns when the Committee first reviewed the project. These concerns have been addressed in the latest design. He commented that it isn't the way he would design it but that it met the guidelines.

Mr. Lee said scale and bulk of buildings in different properties is very difficult and is a very subjective issue.

Mr. Hannum agreed with Mr. Mohn and said the project is unimaginative; it is unfortunate because the design has not realized its potential. He said it meets the minimum requirements of the guidelines. He stated that it is unfortunate the CCRC languished in the discussion over the penthouse decks to the detriment of the rest of the design. He said if the project is approved it will be important to focus on some of the other design elements, fenestration, roof decks, and colors to try to fit more closely into the guidelines.

Ms. Tremaine said new development in Columbia City has had a really difficult time trying to meet the guidelines. She said her objection was the scale of the building. She said the scale should be small and relatively uniform. She said the proposal looks quite large and doesn't fit in with the house next door.

Mr. Abelsen said the siting and setback seem reasonable. With regard to the massing and scale he agrees with Ms. Tremaine about the massing but noted that the development is not quite a house, it is essentially an apartment complex. As a result, it is a reasonable scale and massing. He said the form is subjective as far as trying to match other forms it's got very traditional features so in that regard it is acceptable. He said overall it is probably within the threshold of guidelines stated here and he would accept it.

Mr. Finrow agreed but said he is concerned with the lack of analysis of the context to really show detail about how it does or does not meet the criteria. He thought that one would want to start with the guidelines and then begin to analyze the context and do a lot of research locally to find out what the context is. Relative to the question of height compared to the one next to it, he is surprised there wasn't a drawing that

showed that in detail, that was dimensioned and appropriately scaled; it shows a lapse of analytic rigor. He said when working in an historic district you really have to provide that rigor and it has to be there all the time and it has to be reinforced constantly. He thought this was a bit sloppy. From the point of view of the Guidelines he thinks the building is clearly better than it was. He said given Code requirements, he thought they made a reasonable attempt. The more detailed analysis they will go through in the future is going to be really important to material selection, and he suggested applicant go back and do field analysis about material selection and color and come back prepared with a lot of that detail as well as all the dimensional considerations he mentioned. He said if you look at the other buildings along the street, this one sure looks more like the Hutchinson House than anything along that street and does have a sense of complexity and scale. He thought the applicant is moving in the right direction even though there are some concerns. He would support.

Mr. Matthews said it is difficult to legislate uniqueness. He said in the absence of that he thinks this comes down to acceptability which is a different animal all together. He said the proposal is acceptable and suggested that the Board revisit the guidelines in the future.

Mr. Lee stated it seems the consensus it will be voted for because it sort of fits the zoning envelop and the guidelines, even through the members of the Board inherently have a problem with townhouse design in our neighborhoods.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board move to approve a Certificate of Approval for Demolition of the existing apartment complex at 3815 S. Angeline St. and for the Preliminary Design for twelve dwelling units as described in the application submittal and submitted plans, conditional upon Board review and approval of all construction drawings, finishes and details necessary for a final Certificate of Approval. This action is based on the following:

Relevant Code citations:

Columbia City Landmark District Ordinance

- 25.20.020 Legislative findings and purposes
- 25.20.040 C. Criteria for designation of the District – Architectural
- 25.20.070 Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property
- 25.20.080 Application for certificate of approval
- 25.20.090 B. Board meeting on Certificate of Approval

Landmarks Preservation Ordinance

- 23.45.124 A & B – Residential multi-family, Landmark Structures
- 25.12.750 – Factors to be considered by Board or Hearing Examiner
- 25.12.835 – Demolition

CC Guidelines/Specific

1. Scale of Buildings and Structures. The scale of all structures in relationship to other structures and spaces is important. The scale should continue to be small and relatively uniform.

13. New Construction

a. Siting

- b. Massing/Scale**
- c. Form**
- d. Façade Composition**

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

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

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

Mr. Veith provided a friendly amendment to strike the first two lines, and say “I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for demolition of existing apartment complex at 3815 S. Angeline” and continue.

Mr. Finrow accepted the friendly amendment. No additional motion was required.

060408.23 1065 Summit Ave E
(Harvard-Belmont District)

Ms. Chave introduced the project for the proposed demolition of the 1950’s family room addition on the NW corner. She said there were a number of not-so-fortunate additions to the house in the 1950s and what will be reviewed today is part of that.

Renee Roman, project architect, said the project is phased. She said they are trying to make some repairs to the back yard and build new retaining walls to stabilize the hillside. Because it is such a tight urban site the way they are getting to the back yard it to do a partial demolition of the north wing so they can get construction equipment back there. The retaining wall will be for the house next door at 1073 Summit Ave E. Plans showing the proposed work were provided and showed context of the house next door for which a retaining wall would be provided. The intention is to get equipment back from the upper terrace and go down existing terraces and repair existing retaining walls; and then construct a new retaining wall across to stabilize the hillside.

Ms. Chave said there was a preliminary design Certificate of Approval for a demolition of the garage, a new garage and an addition in the back. What is being reviewed today is not part of that preliminary design.

Mr. Matthews stated the Harvard Belmont committee looked at the project and no one had objections to demolition; he felt this was something that could be reviewed quickly without controversy.

Ms. Roman said the next phase, which the Board had given preliminary approval for, is to remove the garage, create a courtyard to re-establish the glory of the foursquare house, and the garage would be toward the north part of the property.

Mr. Veith asked the location of the adjacent house.

Ms. Chave said it is the house to the north which is a significant contributing house to the District.

Ms. Roman said that several months ago they met with the Harvard Belmont Committee for review of that house(1073); it involved a lot of replacement in-kind. She will ask for Board review and approval of the color and windows when she is ready.

Ms. Chave said the applicants own that house as well; it is one of the oldest in the District. They had reviewed the in-kind repairs with the Harvard Belmont committee; the items which are not in-kind repair will come back to the Board.

Mr. Veith clarified what the Board is reviewing today is the demolition of the addition back of the garage and the other elements have already been approved for demolition.

Ms. Chave said that approval was just preliminary design; preliminary design does not allow an applicant to get a permit, they have to come back for their final design before they can go to DPD to get their demolition and new construction permits.

Mr. Veith stated the garage is not shown on the drawing.

Ms. Chave said the garage is detached and is in the northwest corner.

Ms. Roman provided a photograph showing the garage.

Ms. Roman said the work is time sensitive as the property has an environmentally critical area and to do the work there are only specific windows in the year that they can do the work. If they miss the window they won't be able to do what shores up the two houses for the next year.

Ms. Roman said it is not different from the retaining wall the neighbors have; the house to the south has a wall that extends further then what they are proposing and the house to the north has a terraced backyard at grade, vegetated landscape.

Ms. Chave asked Ms. Roman to explain how they propose to finish the north side of the house.

Ms. Roman explained they are hoping they don't have to finish it off and that they will be able to go seamlessly into the next phase; if not they will take the siding and continue the existing siding around and finish it off the same color. It is temporary but they will make sure it looks like the east side of the house (1065 Summit E).

Mr. Hannum asked if the portion to be demolished would be replaced with a structure.

Ms. Chave explained that because it is not contributing to the District and it is a portion of a larger structure although it was built in the 1950s, replacement is not required.

Mr. Finrow asked if the wall below the house has any particular significance.

Ms. Roman said it is not within public view; there is no significance to it. It is a concrete retaining wall; they are repairing the lower two walls and she showed other walls on the drawing that would be repaired by tying into the new wall.

Mr. Finrow asked if there were significant trees in the area.

Ms. Roman said not as part of this application.

Ms. Roman said all the trees in the Environmentally Sensitive Area will be kept; they will be pruned and will go through a maintenance plan for the landscape.

Public Comment:

Ms. Chave read an email from a neighbor, Andrea Umbach, who referenced Harvard Belmont guidelines and said she was not clear where the development of the property is headed; it is a challenge to determine what guidelines apply to this specific requested removal. Ms. Chave said that Ms. Umbach said she agreed with the removal but she was concerned about eventual reconstruction of the structure that is being removed; she wanted to ensure the structure would be rebuilt according to the City and guidelines; she said she understood according to the guidelines the structure must be built to match original structures in size and style; she wasn't sure if replacing a structure would be considered remodel or new development. (see file for full comment letter)

Mr. Lee stated those issues can be looked at when there is a proposal for the final C of A.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews thought it reasonable and necessary.

Mr. Hannum agreed.

Ms. Tremaine said it made sense.

Mr. Abelsen agreed with the staff report.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for demolition of the 1950's family room addition on the northwest corner of the site, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations and additions meet the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

C. 1.

Guideline: Additions should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is being preserved.

The proposed demolition of the family room addition does not change the character of the original house and is sympathetic to its design. The 1950's family room addition is not sympathetic to the original design of the house and does not contribute to the character of the District.

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

060408.3 NOMINATIONS

060408.31 Seattle Federal Reserve Bank
1015 2nd Ave

Randy Balducci representing the owner said the building was the former location of the Seattle branch which in the past six months has been relocated to a new facility. They nominated the building to clarify the building's status; it is their intent to market and sell the building in 2008.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, presented the nomination. She said the Federal Reserve system is this country's version of a central bank. It was established in 1914 and selected 20 cities that would make up the District making it a somewhat decentralized central bank. It deals with monetary policy and in terms of branches it serves as a banker's bank and serves the industry rather than people. The building was constructed in 1950. Looking at maps dating from around 1900 the financial core clustered north of Pioneer Square on 2nd to 4th Avenues and gradually moved. The commercial banks tended to be in the financial center and tended to serve businesses and gradually as their services expanded to include smaller customers and residential customers the banks moved to serve in more convenient location. After WWII banks became more vehicle-oriented; the banks to the north are often set on sites with parking lots. The Federal Reserve, which serves commercial banks and relates to federal activities, stayed near the original financial core.

Ms. Boyle said the building is four stories above grade with basement and sub-basement below grade. It is made of cast concrete and clad in sandstone and polished red granite; it has bronze doors and thick security glass. The building was designed by NBBJ; while the building gives the appearance of symmetry the entrance is located slightly to one side of the bays. The center windows are set back with pilasters forward; at the first floor are heavy surrounds around the window openings. Originally the way the bank was laid out the lower floors contained the vaults and vehicular circulation. The first floor had a public lobby that allowed access into a service area to the right and the original banking lobby (tellers' lobby) to the left. The building addressed the extreme grade changes by having a granite clad plinth on which the building sits.

Ms. Boyle said entry door projects forward; it is a heavy faceted treatment of the granite. The entry lobby has a fluted bronze finished security station and elevator doors, bronze cladding, terrazzo floors and entries into the two side spaces. The original teller lobby was at one time the most special space in the building; the space was much more open. Changes were made to the space in 1977 when the vestibule was added; when that was done the grillage that was located above the teller row was removed and put above the vestibule. The space was further modified primarily in the 1990s having to do with less public activity. Other changes included a seismic

upgrade in 1990-91; changes to the 4th floor office suite, employee lounge/cafeteria area in 1987-88; security upgrades in 2001 and the addition of the planters in 2006 to further enhance security. The spaces throughout the building are simple with drop ceilings and systems furniture and partitions.

Ms. Boyle said changes starting in the late 1940s brought us to the late mid-century modern building. Other Federal Reserve Bank tended to follow the pattern of Classical buildings in the pre-war era; they have a solidity and were designed coming out of the Depression so have a permanence in solid materials such as solid stone, they project a sense of security and protection, easy legibility. Starting in the 1970s the newer buildings tended to be larger, more exuberant. She said in looking at other buildings done by NBBJ and William Bain Sr., by the early 1950s the firm had been organized and they were grasping new ideas about modernism and expressing them in their buildings. In the context of NBBJ's career, this building's bunker-like quality has aspects that are confusing about what decade it was bringing forth design ideas from.

Ms. Boyle said the building is largely intact; it has retained most of its historic and architectural integrity particularly on the exterior though not in the interior and teller lobby. She didn't think the building met criteria A or B. She said while she thought it important that Seattle was recognized as being a branch of Federal Reserve Bank, this building primarily functioned as a banker's bank and provided few services to the public; it was associated more with the banking industry and the general economic heritage of the City, it doesn't meet Criteria C. With regard to Criterion D, the building dates to 1950; its style is derived from Classical Moderne Architecture which is from several decades earlier. By 1950 architectural styles had moved forward to clearly modern examples. While this building has some unusual characteristics it doesn't represent characteristics of a specific style or period. In terms of its method of construction the only distinctive aspect was the reinforcing in the concrete. NBBJ was a well known firm and Baines was very skilled, well known and very influential in Seattle. This is not one of their outstanding buildings and would not meet Criteria E. The building is set back from 2nd Avenue and is not well seen; it does contrast in scale to skyscrapers around it but that does not provide it with a prominence nor does it contribute to the quality or identity of the neighborhood.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked if the steel reinforcing in the wall is unique or significant.

Ms. Boyle said it was a new kind of expanded metal mesh but didn't have more information.

Mr. Finrow said that all the low rise buildings are being eliminated from downtown Seattle. He asked if there are many low-rise buildings landmarked; he was curious about how rapidly the low rise traditional buildings in the City were being eliminated in the downtown area.

Ms. Boyle cited page 14 of her report and said 1st Avenue is a collection of lower rise buildings: the, Beebe, Holyoke and Brooklyn buildings.

Ms. Chave added the Colman Building, the Bank of California.

Mr. Finrow asked Ms. Boyle if we are being careful to preserve the highest quality examples of the low rise buildings in downtown and that consideration is not an issue in this particular case.

Ms. Boyle said in a general sense that is the case; this is viewed as a category 3 building by the City's downtown survey. She thinks that in Categories 1 and 2 there will be a number of buildings of different sizes and different eras.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historic Society, said that the fact that the building is not a Category 1 building shouldn't diminish its importance because if it was a banker's bank, it was important.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews said he has supported modern buildings several times but doesn't support this one.

Ms. Howard agreed with Mr. Matthews; it was an uncommunicative building and she agrees with the Staff Report.

Mr. Hannum was concerned about the number of low rise buildings in downtown that are being lost but this one does not rise to the level of significance.

Ms. Nicolas agreed and said the building did not meet the threshold and does not have distinct characteristics.

Mr. Finrow agreed that the building did not meet the criteria and thought it looked like Italian Rationalist design.

Mr. Abelsen said proportionately it is not a well designed building; he said perhaps because it is a Federal Reserve Bank it has that significance and it is commanding a view along 2nd Avenue but the building itself does not deserve Board support.

Ms. Strong liked the building partly because it is low scale and the fact that it is set back from the street provides a break in mass of driving down the canyon of 2nd Avenue, however she does not support nomination.

Mr. Veith said he kind of liked the building; the reinforced or extruded window surrounds reminded him of neo-classical architecture. It gives a breathing space on the street but the Jackson office building which has been built to the south and is set back farther, diminishes that effect of the building. He didn't support nomination but he characterized it as a nice building that didn't quite make it.

Ms. Tremaine also worried about low rise buildings being taken down. This building is not communicative as Ms. Howard stated, except that it communicates a coldness; if it had bars on the window she would think it is a jail.

Mr. Lee didn't support nomination and said it was intriguing with all the security at the back when it was occupied.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Federal Reserve Bank at 1015 Second Avenue as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the Staff Report.

MM/SC/MS/CH

10:0:0 Motion approved.

060408.32

Ankeny House
912 2nd Ave W

Mark Huck, property owner provided historic context of the site. He said the house was built in 1891. Rollin Ankeny arrived in Seattle in 1888 and was a banker for a bank that would eventually become part of WAMU. A cedar tree on the site, used by Native Americans for navigation purposes as well as pow wows, was the source of much controversy in 1890 when the suggestion was made to take it down; the tree was felled in 1891 and a curse was said to have been placed on the site.

Mr. Huck said that Eleanor Randolph's dowry from her marriage to Ankeny helped pay for the house which is a variant of Victorian known as a shingle style which is greatly simplified and transitioning to Arts and Crafts and Craftsman that came later. It has been noted that it influenced the Prairie Style made popular by Frank Lloyd Wright. Mr. Huck showed a photo exhibiting the shingle style elements around the turret; there was a randomness or laissez-faire approach to the design to make it feel thrown together as a reaction against the formality and fussiness of the Victorians. Most of the shingles had been replaced by Historic Seattle, who owned the property for a time, during their renovation around 1980. The entryway has a Romanesque arch; the entry door is original with thick leaded glass. All the glass in the house is original. The chimney was removed after the Nisqually earthquake. The trees on the property may be descendants of the great navigation cedar. The lower sunken patio and french doors were a later addition and are not visible from the street. A 1933 photo taken about the time the Goweys purchased the property shows the house largely unchanged from the earlier photos. Today the trees shown in the photo have grown as tall as the apartment building and now block most of the view of the apartment building from the house. Mr. Huck stated that lots of density is coming into the area. To the south of the house an apartment building was constructed in the 1980s and across the street are condos.

Mr. Huck showed interior photos, all the wood is original, the original fireplace remains which worked up until the Nisqually earthquake and now is just for display; there is another fireplace directly above it in the master bedroom. A closet on the 2nd floor has been converted into a bathroom and has recently been renovated.

Mr. Huck said the Ankenys were the original owners of the house; he was a cashier at Puget Sound Bank and later was a financial officer at a number of different companies around Seattle. The Behrens family purchased the house in 1907 and owned it until 1930; he made money in the Yukon, was injured and nursed by a native woman whom he later married. He was in the State House of Representatives for three terms. The Gowey family moved in during the Depression and rented the

house for \$10.00 a month and paid when they could. They opened a rubber band company and had a machine in the basement. They went to the dump at night, got inner tubes, chopped them up into big rubber bands and sold them to Nordstrom. There was a local rival in the rubber band business and the Gowey car was torched by the rivals. The second Mr. Gowey had a large interest in trains and took photos related to transportation; they had train sets in the basement. Historic Seattle took over ownership 1980 – 81 to help preserve it; they renovated the exterior, did foundation work and put covenants on the house to protect it. The Moultrie family purchased it 1981-82 and did some interior renovation leaving a lot of the original woodwork. They sold to the Keatings who lived there until selling to the current owners, the Hucks, in 2000.

Mr. Huck said the significance of the house lies with being representative of the shingle style of Victorian architecture; he hasn't seen another like it in Seattle and it is a wonderful counterpoint to the other Victorian houses on the hill. He said the tree was the most famous occupant of the land and the curse was lifted after 100 years. He wants to preserve the house by landmarking and to be able to influence future development around it. They hope potentially to use the house in the future as a Bed and Breakfast.

Board Questions:

Mr. Matthews said the house, instead of being thrown together, sort of represents an organic growth having to do with the life within.

Mr. Huck agreed and said it is the form follows function; it got away from rigid symmetry and fussiness.

Mr. Hannum said the window sills looked like they were chopped at the trim and asked if there was a different cladding at some time.

Mr. Huck said no. He said there are photos of the construction going on; it was all original material and the cedar shingles were unpainted for a long time.

Ms. Strong asked about the existing covenants on the house that Historic Seattle placed?

Mr. Huck said it is for protection of two things: exterior alterations need to be approved by Historic Seattle, and the house can not be demolished.

Ms. Nicolas asked if the sacred tree was used for anything in the house.

Mr. Huck wasn't sure but they assume it went to a mill. When he dug out his garden he found clam shells and burned out wood.

Mr. Veith said the wood likely went to a boat rather than a house. He asked if Mr. Huck thought about landmarking the interior; interiors of residences are typically not landmarked.

Mr. Huck said no; he thought future owners would value the interior as it is but he also wouldn't want to restrict someone from being able to change paint colors or carpet. He didn't see a real public benefit to doing that.

Mr. Lee said that can be addressed during controls and incentives.

Mr. Huck asked if portions of the interior could be landmarked.

Mr. Lee said yes, mostly entrance areas and main stairs. He suggested the Board nominate more and then pare down.

Ms. Chave recommended nominating the entry hall, parlor, dining room and stairway; those are the strongest candidates on the interior.

Mr. Huck said the good news is the architect of the north property did show some creativity.

Public Comment:

Christine Palmer told Mr. Huck she would look at the easements to see what they have on file that might be helpful.

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, stated the Hucks are new members of the Queen Anne Historical Society and Mr. Huck has been helping in the archives. The home stands out in the neighborhood. This is an excellent example of a different style; she supports nomination.

Leanne Olson supported nomination for many reasons: its age, style, history, and the folklore of the Pow Wow tree and the Native American history. She said that within a few blocks there are numerous significant buildings that are already City landmarks.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Tremaine said it was a wonderful house and supported nomination.

Mr. Veith said the house has to be nominated; it is not only an interesting example of the particular style but it is very unique. He said it is a curious house and the Board should take a close look at it.

Ms. Strong supported nomination based on the Staff Report and the distinctive style or characteristic of the house and also the lot size is unique.

Mr. Abelsen agreed the house is a shingle style and said it was a playful approach to design. In addition to the two criteria Staff recommended he thought the designer, if information could be found, would be something to contribute to this project. It is remarkably intact and is a great treasure; he supported nomination.

Mr. Finrow thought it a terrifically interesting building; it is not the best example of a shingle style but maybe one of the best and the best in Seattle and is worth saving.

Ms. Nicolas said it would be a great addition to the Queen Anne landmarks; it is a very special building and she supports the D and F criteria.

Mr. Hannum supported nomination and thought it a great presentation. He also supported nominating interior portions.

Ms. Howard thanked Mr. Huck for the excellent presentation and said it is a great example of a shingle style house; she supported nomination.

Mr. Matthews said the shingle style is comparatively rare in the northwest and this is an excellent example. He said there is a house by Frank Lloyd Wright in Oak Park before he dreamed up Prairie Style that combines that curved bay with a gable similar to this. It is an excellent example of the style; he didn't think the other criteria so much though he is tempted by the rubber band wars. He supports nomination of the interior.

Mr. Lee said it is a gorgeous house and he supported nomination. He recommended nomination of the whole site, exterior and some of the interiors. He said the whole site because looking forward it helps to negotiate solutions and departures from code. He didn't think it would be an encumbrance and recommends nominating the whole site.

Mr. Veith said he was very intrigued by the history of the site and is glad the 100 year limit on the curse ran out. He said the Duwamish have a tribal organization that might have some information.

Action: I move approval of the Ankeny House at 912 2nd Avenue West 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, and the following elements of the interior: the entry hall and main stairway, the parlor, and the dining room; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for July 16, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

060408.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

060408.41 Terminal Sales Annex Building
1931 Second Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Chave presented a letter from Marty Goodman from the Justen Company requesting a 60 day extension.

Mr. Matthews left at 6:15 PM.

Mr. Goodman said they met with the ARC on March 28 and received a favorable response on their proposed solution; they are developing that design and are scheduled to come back to ARC June 27 with more detailed design. Once that design

is approved they will go to the DRB and then the MUP process and then hopefully Certificate of Approval. Things are moving forward but it is taking time.

It was determined that an extension of 90 days would be allowable and reasonable.

Action:

I move to provide a 90 day extension.

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

060408.5 **BOARD BRIEFING**

060408.51 King County Landmark Challenge Grants Program

Flo Lentz, 4Culture, explained they are a funder of arts, heritage, preservation programs and individual projects in King County. Most funding programs are funded by the collection of a portion of the King County lodging taxes. Most of those programs go for the arts but they do fund heritage organizations. The preservation funding has been limited to one small program and that was always limited to eligibility to designated King County landmarks, properties under the King County program outside of the City of Seattle either in Unincorporated King County or cities that have interlocal agreements with King County program.

Ms. Lentz said they are opening up a program that is open to landmarks in the City of Seattle. The goal is to fund quality projects that have 5 features:

- 1) demonstrable degree of threat
- 2) have a strong project proponent
- 3) offer substantial long range public benefit
- 4) show thoughtful preliminary planning
- 5) demonstrate a high degree of likely success

Ms. Lentz explained they are looking for larger, more visible projects; they are asking for a minimum \$10,000.00 request with a \$10,000.00 match to be put into the project so they can encourage private investment and applicants to fundraise on their own. They will be liberal in interpreting the match so if dollars have been spent in the previous years and those are documented, that can count toward the match; cash on hand or funds to be raised in coming year can also count. They are starting with a small pot of money from interest earned on a fund balance; the total amount in the pot will be between \$100,000 and \$120,000. They could fund 5 – 10 projects. It is open to City landmarks, County landmarks and to areas where there is no program like Bellevue, Renton and Enumclaw where they will open it up to National Register properties. There is a new revenue stream for preservation and heritage. In 2005 the State Legislature added \$1.00 to the document filing fee in each county and earmarked it for historic preservation and heritage programming. Every county was to set aside this money and for a couple years no one was aware of it. They began looking at the program about a year ago and the County Council was not aware of it, no one had kept track of the dollars. Right now the County Council is doing an audit of what happened to the money. What happens to the money going forward is up in the air right now. 4 Culture believes that money should go to the work of the field out to bricks and mortar programs and heritage organizations. The County Council will be looking at that through a task force they are forming; they hope this will be

funded by this revenue stream going forward. Task force members have not been selected yet; the ordinance hasn't passed yet. The task force will be the group that decides on the allocation of funding for that program. The dollar amount collected in the previous year was \$600,000 in King County. The Ordinance authorizes the County Council to make decisions on how the money will be used. The proposed Ordinance to form the task force has been referred to the Parks and Utility Committee of the County Council; it is chaired by Jane Hague. There is a lot of interest on the part of landmark owners, preservation programs, and historical organizations.

Mr. Abelsen asked if projects have to meet all five criteria or is risk most significant.

Ms. Lentz said that all five criteria would be looked at and one is no more important than another. When forming the program they talked about whether endangerment ought to be the most important criteria but ultimately decided that rules out a lot of good projects. When asked if churches would be eligible Ms. Lentz stated that they would be.

6:30 PM Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator