



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 425/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, July 2, 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
Mark Hannum

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Henry Matthews
Alyce Conti

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:34 PM.

070208.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meetings of May 7, 2008

MM/SC/HM/CH

9:0:0 Minutes approved as amended.

070208.2

CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

070208.21

Fire Station No. 17

1020 NE 50th St.

Proposed renovation and addition

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Ms. Chave explained the application; the project has been to ARC several times; she introduced Don Brubeck, project architect with Bassetti architects, who would present the final form.

Mr. Brubeck stated the renovation is part of the City's Fire Levy program that is affecting almost all the fire stations in the City and is the first comprehensive rehab the station has had since 1987. The historic station will remain; the project intends to keep the station viable for the long term improving its seismic resistance, operational capacity and replacing systems and adapting crew quarters for gender neutral and healthy work environment. The station needs to adapt to larger emergency vehicles and to introduce training facilities for all the stations that this Battalion Station serves. This proposal is to modify some exterior features as well as the site which is surrounded by dense mixed use. On the existing building they propose to demolish a wing that currently houses a racquetball court and build an addition of about 7700 square feet.

Mr. Brubeck explained that the work in the existing building also includes replacement of all windows which currently are aluminum windows from 1986. The new windows will match the mullion and muntin profiles and the number of panes exactly from 1930. They will infill a couple window panels on the alley side with louvers for ventilation and reroof the building and replace, modify and add rooftop exhaust equipment affecting the kitchen, apparatus bays and crew quarters. They propose to modify a couple skylights, reglaze one and cover a couple that are not visible from the street. He explained they will repaint the building; it is currently white and gray and, keeping the same values, plan to warm up the colors using more putty and bronze colors. The doors will remain the fire station red. The main apparatus bay will be cream with bronze for the setback portion on the 2nd floor (crew quarters).

Mr. Brubeck explained that light fixtures that will be replaced; the ones installed in 1987 will be replaced with more shielded and more efficient fixtures. He stated the historic walls, apparatus bay doors, the drill tower, and the poles will all remain. Site modifications include landscaping along the street; they will add street trees and a planting strip; they will relocate the patio for the dining area.; they will add shrub and small tree landscape and a more formal entry court around the existing flagpole; around the drill court they will add a fence and thicket type buffer, vines growing on sound barrier walls at the alley and vines growing on trellis at the west window on the alley side.

Board Questions:

Ms. Nicolas asked for an example of what would make the building more gender neutral.

Mr. Brubeck responded that instead of an open bunk room with gang showers and toilets it will be individual sleep rooms and individual bathrooms across the hall.

Mr. Finrow arrived at 3:45 pm.

Mr. Veith stated one of the three bay doors is different.

Mr. Brubeck said that all three will have overhead sectional doors; the different doors on the drawing is a result of putting two types on one drawing for bid purposes.

Mr. Veith thought the water feature, which had been described as a way of maintaining symmetry in the blocks, was unnecessary and it is OK for that block to be a bit asymmetrical as it is a modern building and the general layout is asymmetrical.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee stated there had been some discussion about the water feature which is really overflows from the roof; generally ARC thought it was an excellent addition.

Mr. Abelsen thought it was a very thoughtful, careful approach to a building that is simple in its own design; the addition proposed is really in support of that rather than contrasting against it.

Mr. Finrow thought the proposal looked good.

Mr. Hannum thought it complementary.

Ms. Howard liked the use of color to make the addition recede a bit.

Mr. Lee said it is an excellent example of how an addition should be designed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed renovation and addition, and associated site alterations, as per the submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #122465 as the proposed renovation and addition, and associated site alterations, do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

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

MM/SC/MT/CH

10:0:0 Motion approved.

070208.22

Hoge Building
705 2nd Avenue
Proposed awning

Sarah Sodt explained the application for an awning on a storefront on the southwest corner of the building on Cherry; ARC reviewed this and was generally favorable.

Nicholas Lai explained his business, Coco Banana, sold juice, smoothies and has a salad bar. He wants to put up an awning with the logo and business name for visibility. The awning will be angled up as the street is on a slope.

Ms. Sodt stated there is currently no awning; attachment should go through the mortar joints.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said it is not the perfect way to deal with a façade but it can be removed so it doesn't destroy historic fabric and it is simple so it doesn't complicate the façade.

Mr. Lee thought the color of the fabric is complementary to the color of the stone.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed new awning and signage.

This action is based on the following:

2. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 111889 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*.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

070208.23

Pier 55
1101 Alaskan Way
Proposed design revisions

Ms. Sodt explained the application for proposed design revisions to a previously approved design. ARC reviewed and asked for additional detail on trimming which had been provided and she passed out to the Board.

Michael Tripp, Pier 55 Shirt Company, said they are combining three spaces and redoing entrances. They originally applied to the Board to redo the entrances on both facades and the Board approved lowering windows on Alaskan Way façade and to combine spaces into an opening that would be sliding glass doors. Now they are asking to go back to what was originally there; they want to go back to traditional retail doors similar to what is there now. Currently the doors are 3' x 6 ½' tall and they propose enlarging to 4' wide and 8' high. The front of the building will remain as is.

Mr. Tripp explained on the north elevation they propose to clean up the mish mash of windows and put in two 4' traditional retail swing doors, side lites with transoms

above. Previously the Board approved the sign on the north façade to put it to the left of the entrance, down low. They are proposing now to put it back above the doors to give it a cleaner look. At ARC a couple Board members asked for clarification on the entrance which he provided using a drawing.

Mr. Finrow asked the applicant why they were making changes when they seem so slight.

Mr. Tripp said it is just a choice to give it a bigger entrance.

Mr. Lee stated they are not lowering the windows as previously planned so this is a fairly minimal change to something that was done in the mid-1980s.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith thought this straightforward and the applicant has reduced the complexity of the changes made. The new doors, although initially seem asymmetrical because they no longer have windows on both side, they're set in with the pattern of the windows above and are more in character with the general approach. He said it represents a minimal change on the front and a cleansing on the north side.

Mr. Lee thought it was an improvement.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations and business signage.

This action is based on the following:

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

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

070208.3 DESIGNATIONS

070208.31 Terry Building
320 Terry Ave. N

Sharon Coleman, Vulcan, explained they support the designation, exterior only, and introduced Sonja Sokol-Furesz and Susan Boyle who would present the designation information.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said the 320 Terry Avenue Building is located on the east side of Terry Avenue N between Thomas and Harrison Streets. South Lake Union started as an early mixed use urban neighborhood: industrial, commercial use buildings scattered with wood frame residential structures of various scales.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz provided context of the site; today the neighborhood has more consolidated parcels with some half and full block developments. In the late 1800s sawmills and shingle mills were predominant around the lake. Breweries, laundries, clothing, manufacturing were in the neighborhood amongst the low scale residential. In 1909 a Northern Pacific Railroad spur line dropped down along the west side of Lake Union and down Terry Avenue North; a small freight depot was constructed on the west side of Terry circa 1912 and the Terry Building was built directly across the street in 1915. There were primarily low scale, industrial and commercial development continuing into the 1920s; after WWII the South Lake Union industrial base contracted and the residential population declined. Commercial manufacturing uses began to increase and quite a few construction related business located in the neighborhood. There was an extreme grade change between Boren and Terry Avenue N. She said a 1962 aerial photo showed the construction of I-5; Ms. Sokol-Furesz said the freeway cut off the neighborhood from Capitol Hill which further solidified the link between the neighborhood and the lake as well as the South Lake Union and Eastlake neighborhoods. The freeway made the neighborhood more attractive for larger scale residential and business development which increased after the 1960s.

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

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said the building sits on a 60 x 120 site and has a concrete foundation with full basement, has bearing brick perimeter walls with concrete base and decorative details on the primary west façade. The interior structure consists of heavy timber post and beam. The four bays are separated by pilasters; each bay consists of one large opening at the first story and then an opening at the 2nd story with three 9/9 single hung wood sash windows; the windows are original. Detailing on the west façade consists of a soldier course above the window openings, brick sills, and concrete details: banding at the parapet base, darts at the top of each pilaster, blank shield detail peaked parapets and between the first and second story is a rectangular detail with a diamond in the center. She said it is a straightforward building but has nice detailing.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said openings on the first story have non-original infill but the openings are legible; the third bay from the left has an overhead door, it is not original but is consistent with 1937 tax record photo showing an overhead door in that location. The alley view shows the same bay rhythm and window grouping as primary west façade but without the decorative detailing and instead of the face brick, uses common brick of the sidewalls. The original windows remain in most of the openings including the middle two bays at the first story. Along the top of the sidewall is signage remnant. The butcher block painted signage is from the 1970s but the horizontal is consistent with what is visible in the 1937 tax record photo. She said the parapet steps down west to east and there are four large skylights.

Ms. Boyle provided photos of the interior of the building. She said the basement is relatively open. The first floor has partitions with an interior driveway and an office in the back and services spaces along the north side of the front half. The upstairs is divided front and back. She wasn't sure if the perimeter walls had been plastered but thought they may have been. The framing is post and beam with approximate 10 x 10 posts and 10 x 12 beams with cardecking above that.

Mr. Veith stated when a wall was plastered there would be a lath every 10th joint.

Ms. Boyle presumed it had been plastered. It became professional offices in the 1980s during a high time of exposing brick. The back space is lower because of the roof slope so it is not quite as dramatic and has HVAC equipment in there.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz explained they looked at other extant brick commercial or industrial buildings in the neighborhood; she provided photos and explained some had been significantly altered. She said they believe the building does not meet Criteria A or B. She said it meets Criteria C because of its association with the development of South Lake Union and the circa 1912 freight depot that was formerly directly across the street; this building was occupied for 60 years by Kelly Goodwin Hardwoods and other cabinet makers and represents early construction related business that clustered in the area. Its siting on the railroad spur line as well as its early presence in the neighborhood make it significantly associated with the early development of South Lake Union.

Ms. Boyle said it does meet Criterion D in that it represents a sturdy vernacular type of industrial structure. The neighborhood is changing so it may meet Criterion F as well in terms of its contrast to other buildings in the neighborhood.

Mr. Finrow asked if the parapet wall is original.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said in the 1937 tax record photo it looks like just signage across the top but the original drawings do show it.

Mr. Veith noted from the description in the report he had the idea the added partitions left the structure visible and it seemed clear they could be easily removed.

Ms. Boyle thought that was the case in the front but on the 2nd floor it is behind things because of the construction.

Mr. Veith asked if the 2nd floor office went all the way to the back.

Ms. Boyle stated it is two spaces and is half and half; the corridor and stairwell go up a little bit beyond the front space along the south side and then both offices are relatively open though the back may have a few closed offices.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee advised the Board to say whether they support designation or not, why and to refer to criteria.

Mr. Finrow said yes on D, C maybe but D is appropriate.

Ms. Tremaine thought D is appropriate; it is a well-built building with a lot of integrity.

Ms. Howard agreed with the Staff Report.

Ms. Nicolas supported designation based on C, D and F.

Mr. Abelsen said yes on D; it was significant to its period of time, its relationship to the rail line and its use at the time is significant to the culture and economy of Seattle.

Mr. Martinson supported designation based on D; C possibly.

Mr. Lee asked why C wasn't included on the Staff Report.

Ms. Chave said she was not convinced it met the double significance requirement of the criterion; she said it is worth of consideration but she wasn't totally convinced.

Ms. Strong supported designation based on D and possibly on F; it is representative of the type of building in the neighborhood. The siting and the age are appropriate considerations.

Mr. Veith said yes based on D and F; C, he agrees with the Staff Report. With so much of the context gone it is hard to get double significance. He liked the interior and the fact that the structure is available; it is important to consider that the brick façade is very controlled symmetry but also backed up by the structure going back and the building as an embodiment as a particular method of construction, having that structure available is important. Although parts of the interior have been modified, he would like to include some sort of notice of the interior and the structural bay pattern and its method.

Mr. Lee said it is rare to have the whole structural bay system in a warehouse building.

Mr. Veith said the front of the 2nd floor and the basement seems to be fairly open. The Board isn't typically in the practice of designating basements; in a structure such as this where the structure is left to be what it needs to be one always expects to be building around it and hiding it or stacking things in front of it.

Ms. Chave said the Board had a similar discussion about the Supply Laundry Building; it had a similar structural situation on the interior and ended up no interior designation.

Mr. Finrow said the question for him is whether you can designate a structure as opposed to an interior. This building is really just about structure; it is not much about interior. He expressed concern that in other cases just facades are saved but nothing inside. In cases where it is a wonderful structure but not much of an interior, he was in favor of designating the structure of the building.

Ms. Sodt said for all the Central Waterfront Piers, designation included all exposed ceilings and truss systems.

Mr. Hannum said the building is unremarkable and utilitarian. He supports designation because the owner supports it and because of its siting in the South Lake Union area. Of the extant brick buildings it is probably one of the better examples; he supports on D.

Mr. Lee compared it to the Bon Marche Stables where it was important that it was the last one.

Mr. Veith agreed. It is not a remarkable building but it is a good example of what you can do with simple, almost vernacular building. Its remarkable-ness is just that it is an extremely good example of an unremarkable building.

Ms. Chave stated it has its integrity; a lot of warehouse buildings don't.

Mr. Hannum said it is important to note it is the context of its surroundings more than just the building itself.

Mr. Lee said it is unremarkable but it is elegant in how it has been designed from outside. He supports designating the exterior only.

Ms. Tremaine agreed and said it is a nice building but it needs to have the flexibility.

Mr. Abelsen said it is somewhat unremarkable; the structure is interesting but it is more significant to its time, its history and the development of the area. The design, the cardecking are evident in other buildings around the City, this may be unique in the area. He would not support the interior.

Mr. Martinson agreed and would not support the interior.

Mr. Lee supported based on Criterion D.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Terry Avenue Building at 320 Terry Avenue North a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

070208.32

Brasa/Metropolitan Press Printing Company
2107 Third Avenue

Sarah Sodt stated this building is listed on the Downtown Survey as a Category 1 building.

Mimi Sheridan, consultant for the City, provided the neighborhood context of the building and stated it was built in 1923. The building's decorated combination of tall arched windows, an arched parapet, a red tile roof and buff brick facing show its Mission or Mediterranean influence. The two-story building has 12,960 square foot rectangular in plan, measuring 60 feet wide and 108 feet deep.

The main façade on 3rd Avenue is composed of five two-story arches. They are arranged symmetrically, with a center entrance bay flanked by three window bays on each side. The wider center bay has a recessed arched entry with a tall arched multi-paned window above. The two flanking bays are two-story arches. The lower part of each arch has a display window with three-light transom. The second story has arched 9-light pivoting windows. Spandrels between the stories have a circle motif; according to the original plans these are made of wood. Each of the outer bays also has a tall second story window matching the others, but with a small arch on the first story. The small arch at the southeast corner contains a multi-paned window, while that at the northeast corner contains the entry to the upstairs offices. This entry has an original multi-paned wood door with an arched transom.

The arched entry at the center is deeply recessed and enclosed with a highly decorative modern gate of wrought iron. A new door, with modern glass sidelights and transom, provides access to the restaurant. Above the entry is a large V-shaped projecting sign with the name Brasa.

The south elevation, facing the parking lot, is clad with red common brick and has an old painted sign but no other particular features. The rear elevation, on the alley, is clad with red brick on the upper level and concrete on the ground floor. It has the original 12-light metal window sash on the second floor. At ground level are a secondary entry, large louver vents and a considerable amount to utility equipment and ducting for the restaurant.

Ms. Sheridan stated the building has a high degree of integrity. Its style and presence make it stand out in comparison to typical vernacular light industrial and commercial buildings. It is one of the most intact of the few remaining examples of the many printing plants and light industrial buildings that were once located throughout Belltown. The original tenant, Metropolitan Printing Press Company, was one of the numerous printing companies and other light industrial use that took advantage of Belltown's cheaper land. This allowed companies to have larger facilities with easier truck access, while still being close to downtown customers.

Metropolitan Printing Press Building is also an excellent example of the early work of George Wellington Stoddard, a prolific local architect/engineer. The straightforward industrial interior is enclosed within an unusually decorative shell expressing a Mission/Mediterranean influence. Stoddard was best known for

Modernist Commercial and Institutional buildings but he also had a considerable residential practice. Ms. Sheridan described the Brasa Building as an early eclectic work of Stoddard's that can be considered outstanding.

The building meets Criterion C; by design it is a loft building with open spaces and high ceilings; large windows bring light into work areas. This is part of the industrial heritage of Belltown; the building was intended to be used by Metropolitan Printing. Ms. Sheridan provided examples of nearby industrial buildings for comparison in terms of industrial use.

Ms. Sheridan stated this building meets Criterion D in that it expresses or gives a form to this particular style; it does embody the style by defining characteristics of the style adapted to industrial use and this location in the northwest. She said it is common that the style is expressed only on the façade. She said the Mission Revival Style is suggestive of imitative of the earlier Mission Style but simpler without ornament. It is different from Spanish Eclectic or Spanish Baroque which are more ornate. Mission Revival basically took various elements, borrowed them and adorned basic shapes. She showed the range of Mission Revival Style building and showed how the style was adapted for industrial use.

Ms. Sheridan described the expression of elements, the faux bell towers, faux openings, and the tile roof. The tile is typical ornament for this type of building although traditionally it would have been red rather than green. The most eclectic element added is the spandrels; they are the only the element that doesn't really fit strictly within the Mission Revival Style. The material is a logical extension of the stucco; most Mission Style buildings were made of adobe or adobe bricks. In the northwest using tan or buff colored brick would be logical way to do it.

Ms. Sheridan explained the Metropolitan Printing/Brasa building embodies the Mission Revival style as interpreted in a light industrial and commercial building. It is one of the most intact reminders of Belltown's industrial heritage. It is an outstanding work of Stoddard, reflecting his early use of revival styles.

Larry Johnson, Melody McCutcheon and William Justen represented the building owner, Samis, who does not support designation.

Larry Johnson, Architectural Historian provided handouts to the Board and agreed with Ms. Sheridan's presentation. The building is a light mid-block industrial building with a lot of light; it was designed with the largest windows possible. He said building has basically the characteristic individual parts of Mission Revival Style; on an eclectic building they are sort of applied on the main façade. This is the only building he has seen that has everything in it. He described the design elements: the red, now metal roof, the shaped parapet, the arches emulating an arcade and the bell towers. He said a lot of Mission Revival buildings are more than just a façade; this building is just a façade. Mr. Johnson showed other buildings design by Stoddard who, he said, was versatile and successful architect. He said in the middle of the Depression, the Metropolitan Printing Company moved out of this building and chose Stoddard to design their new custom designed building.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Johnson why the building is not significant.

Mr. Johnson stated he likes the building; it because of its lightness on the street it contrasts with some of the darker, redder, brick buildings in the Belltown area. He said it is a borderline building; he thought it a bit south of the border and Ms. Sheridan thinks it is higher than then border, but that it is really close.

Melody McCutcheon said it is important to apply the criteria as they are actually worded, not that we asked if the building is special or try to analyze it in some sort of lay language but that we actually apply the criteria in the Ordinance. Criteria C, D, and E are the ones under discussion; Criterion C, from her point of view, this building was not designed for the Metropolitan Press or the evidence in the record does not support that conclusion. It is labeled as a two-story utility building for George Thompson; maybe by the time of construction it was for Metropolitan Press but from the drawings and the other evidence there isn't enough to conclude that this building was designed for Metropolitan Press. Metropolitan Press was in the building for only seven years and then they had a building built for them to their specifications. Because of its industrial use she wondered if the building met Criterion C; she said Criterion C requires double significance. She cited Ms. Sheridan's report which stated this building had a long industrial use but under Criterion C because it has had an industrial use she asked if that means it is associated in a significant way with a significant aspect of our heritage. There are a lot of buildings with a history of industrial use and that does not make them meet Criterion C.

Ms. McCutcheon said in the Nomination Report, there is no mention of the Mission Revival Style so was not of particular significance; now there is talk about what Mission Revival Style is. She said this building is eclectic; there are decorative elements that have some Mission style to them but this building does not embody the Mission style. She said rather than use the dictionary definition of embody, she said the way this Board has applied this term before is that embody means that it has most of the distinctive elements of a particular style and it has to have coherence to it and an ability to express that style in a coherent way.

Ms. McCutcheon said regarding Criterion E, she cited Ms. Sheridan who said it is outstanding because it reflects an early use of Revival Style and asked if that is what "outstanding" means. She said this is an architect who is know for his Modern style and that Mr. Johnson would say this does not help us understand Stoddard's Modern style. She said it is an early, immature work of Mr. Stoddard and it doesn't help us understand his body of work and by itself it is not an outstanding work of his. She said in applying the actual Criteria they do not believe it meets C, D, or E.

Board Questions:

Mr. Finrow stated that as an architect, the work of an architect changes quite a bit through time especially the more significant architects and their work. He said he did not buy the argument that this was an "early, immature work" of Stoddard. He said all work of architects has meaning and significance and architects that have done as many buildings as Stoddard has done, and who practice as long as he practiced, will have interesting work of all kinds through a career. He said Ms. McCutcheon's comments were incorrect. He explained if one looks at Frank Lloyd Wright's work, and compared the early Prairie House to the Marin County Courthouse, they are completely different buildings but are still outstanding work of Frank Lloyd Wright.

Public Comment:

Janet Thompson stated she thought the building is an outstanding example of Stoddard's work. She said she wouldn't be interested in his later work because there is a lot around; this building stands out. She is fairly familiar with the Mission Revival style and thinks this does meet the architectural elements to a greater degree than a lesser degree. This building makes Belltown much more interesting.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum said this building has a high degree of integrity; it is intact with the exception of a couple small changes which are probably better for the building like the metal roof. He said this building is Mission Revival and cited a comment made by Mr. Veith it doesn't matter sometimes whether it is a specific architectural style. He agrees with the Staff Report to support C, D, and E; it is a unique building and its fenestration supports the use of a press

Mr. Veith the building doesn't quite get over the threshold for double significance to meet Criterion C. With regard to Criterion E, the building could be characterized as a good or competent work of the designer but wasn't sure it was outstanding and thought there are better examples of Stoddard's skill and work. When looking at the slides this time, he felt better about the detailing of the building, but was still leaning toward not supporting D and would wait to hear the rest of the Board.

Ms. Strong supported the nomination specifically on Criterion D. She was impressed with the design of the elegance of a utilitarian building; it has a presence and makes a statement from the street and it is a lovely addition to Belltown.

Mr. Martinson supported the designation based on Criterion D although he thought C applied as well.

Mr. Abelsen supported designation and considers the building eclectic with Mission flourishes with treatment at parapet top and some of the detailing and the very tall arches. He noted that when talking about Mission, the style was found in the southwest and the buildings were designed to ward off heat; here in Seattle that isn't an issue. Here there is a need for light and this building does that in a significant way.

Ms. Nicolas supported based on Criterion D; the building has great presence and style, and it contributes greatly to the neighborhood.

Ms. Howard supported the designation based on D and said she could support E but is less enthusiastic. She thought the adaptation of the building style to the northwest was significant.

Ms. Tremaine supported designation based on D and said the building has A+ integrity; it is an intact loft light industrial style which adds interest and architectural excitement to the neighborhood.

Mr. Finrow supported designation based on C, D, and E and said we are rapidly losing industrial buildings in the Belltown area and this building's heritage is significant to the community, so he strongly supported designation based on C. Regarding D, he agreed and said it is an elegant expression of the Mission Revival style. The building meets Criterion E because it is an outstanding work of a young architect; when looking at the detailing especially the brick interfacing and how it works in terms of the surface of the building. He thought it a choice piece of early work by this architect.

Mr. Lee stated that in his opinion the building is not significant and thought the earlier discussed Terry Avenue building is an elegant ordinary building; he said he didn't know that this building was doing and that it was just a box with some decorative work attached to it.

Mr. Veith stated he would not support either.

Ms. McCutcheon asked on which Criterion the building would be designated.

Mr. Lee noted that all Board members who support designation are in favor of D and recommended the designation be based on Criterion D.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Metropolitan Press Printing Co./Brasa Building at 2107 Third Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/RM/MH 8:2:0 Motion approved. Mssrs. Lee and Veith opposed.

Mr. Finrow left at 5:30 pm.

070208.4 NOMINATIONS

070208.41 Nathan Hale High School
10750 30th Ave NE

Don Gillmore, Seattle School District, presented the nomination. He said the building was designed by Mallis and de Hart on the main 1963 building; Hart Lanz and Hall added an addition in 1972; and Mahlum Architects added a theater addition in 2005. The architectural style is mid-century modern from 1963, contemporary modern for the theater. The site is on 18 acres, has five pedestrian bridges over Thornton Creek, a shop building, library, theater, sports complex and portables. The neighborhood is single family residential surrounding the school, Thornton Creek runs through the site. Summit K-12 is directly across the street.

Mr. Gillmore said the main building is two-story and is divided into seven major sections: classroom area, cafeteria/kitchen, gymnasium, teen life center, library, performing arts center, shop, and a number of portables. The roof shape on the main building is a flat concrete slab; the gym has a folded concrete plate roof. The theater has flat metal decking and the portables are flat wood. Fenestration is aluminum

storefront; aluminum storefront and aluminum curtain wall on the theater; aluminum fixed and hopper units on the original 1963 building.

Mr. Gillmore stated a variety were used including brick cladding on the library addition and the original building; concrete block at the theater; aggregate cast panels on the 1963 panels. There is a folded plate concrete roof; preformed metal siding on the side of the theater; glass and aluminum curtain wall and wood lapped siding on the portables. The interior finishes include painted concrete block walls, aluminum windows and storefront; acoustical ceiling tiles throughout most of the building; painted glue on tiles; most of the building has vinyl floor; flush mounted hanging fluorescent fixtures; lockers are standard painted steel lockers; doors are wood on the interior. Mr. Gillmore stated the daylighting is a variety of window types.

Mr. Gillmore stated the building does not meet Criteria A, B, C, D, E or F. He said the building is not prominent in its location; major alterations have changed the original character of the building; the building is not an outstanding of Mallis and DeHart's work; and there is no significant historical or cultural context.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum asked why the name was changed from Meadowbrook to Nathan Hale.

Mr. Veith said with older schools the School Board's policy was to name all the schools after national heroes.

Mr. Martinson asked the applicant to comment on the precast components throughout the building.

Mr. Gillmore said the aggregate panels are precast and the basic structure of the building is precast T's. The structure is basically a two-story precast T, much of which is concealed. Each column is the main part of the T and they are cantilevered out from column to column and meet in the center. He wasn't sure what the intermediate floor structure was and thought it was just flat slab.

Mr. Martinson asked if any other schools in the district were precast.

Mr. Gillmore wasn't sure.

Mr. Veith asked if Thornton Creek was open.

Mr. Gillmore stated the creek was open the total length of this property.

Ian Kells, Heery International, said it is the south branch of Thornton Creek and runs west to east across the property and then merges with the main branch just east of the property at Meadowbrook Homes, which is a new containment pond built by SPU about 20 years ago. There are portions of the creek that are underground but on this property it is all exposed.

Mr. Veith expressed confusion about the Adams School, which is now Summit and asked if it was on former dairy property and if the golf course was also part of the dairy property.

Mr. Veith asked if the property had been acquired by condemnation.

Mr. Gillmore said it had happened in the 1980s; they did condemnation for the African American Academy in the 1990s. He wasn't sure if that happened in the 1950s and 1960s.

Public Comment:

In response to Mr. Veith's question, Ms. Sheridan said she thought it was all former dairy property.

Christine Palmer, Historic Seattle, asked who did the research and wrote the nomination and if a consultant was hired or if the school did it themselves.

Janet Thompson, neighbor of the school, agreed with the district recommendations and said the school does not fit the Criteria.

Gary Siebert, neighbor of the school, explained the school was built on top of the golf course; it is part of Fisher Tract and had nothing to do with the Lovell dairy which is on the other side of the Creek as part of Fisher Place.

Karen Rugen, community member, agreed with the information presented and asked the Board not to nominate.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Martinson thought the use of precast elements might be significant; he wanted to hear what the rest of the Board thought.

Mr. Abelsen thought the precast structure of the building was significant; he said all the other buildings were misguided attempts by the architect at the time and do not contribute at all to the school's well being or community well being. He didn't believe that folded plate of other structural elements of the other buildings are of any significance but simply based on the delicate and finely detailed structural elements of the original building, he would support although he would not support nomination for the entire campus.

Mr. Martinson agreed with Mr. Abelsen.

Ms. Nicolas did not support nomination; the design elements are too across the board. She said it is difficult to apply any of the standards to this nomination.

Ms. Howard thought there were integrity issues; the additions are not harmonious. From a design standpoint it clearly doesn't meet D. She is intrigued by the precast elements; if she were to support nomination it would be on that basis but wants to hear what the other Board members have to say.

Ms. Tremaine and Ms. Strong both disagreed with the nomination based on the Staff Report although Ms. Strong did think the school a dominant feature in the neighborhood, but it doesn't contribute to the distinctive quality of the neighborhood.

Mr. Veith said the integrity is pretty good; the two additions are pretty discreet. He said the main problem is the “hand fisted” application of technology and doesn’t think there has been architectural advantage made from it. The very high, almost arch, suggested by the Ts and their slender columns one expects to see more in there than just “plugging the holes”. He said it is hard to make an argument for Criterion D. He didn’t think it an outstanding work and there are better buildings by this firm. He said any building that is large in a residential neighborhood is in contrast but that is just an accident that it is a big building in a small neighborhood; from a block and a half away it is barely noticeable and is almost hidden. The report left him with a lot of questions so he is reluctant to make a judgment on A and B and isn’t sure due diligence was done; he doesn’t have reason to suspect the applicant’s conclusions are not correct just that he was curious about how much review did they do before they decided that it doesn’t look like anyone or an event is associated with the site. He said overall he can’t get engaged with this building; it is hard to align it with any criteria and come out with a positive result. He will vote no on nomination. He said he thought Sealth H.S. did a better job of integrating the precast components that this building does and Sealth didn’t make it over the threshold either. He tried to look at the skill with which an element is used; this is a straightforward structural system and he doesn’t want to give it special value. There are really nice examples of precast structure but usually they make something architectural out of the structure and use it architecturally; in this case several Board members can look at it and see that it has precast elements and it has a folded plate, but it is like saying it has beams and a column. The elements are not used in a way that tells anything special about the building.

Mr. Hannum did not support nomination because it does not meet any of the Criteria; he said there are interesting elements but it does not form a cohesive whole.

Mr. Lee agreed and said it doesn’t meet F. He agreed with Mr. Veith that it did not meet D because it is not particular significant use of technology to warrant designation.

Ms. Howard stated she had been on the fence but Mr. Veith’s comments clarified things for her; she thought Sealth had a high degree of architectural coherence which this building lacks; she did not support nomination.

Mr. Abelsen thought the design and engineering is significant; it is very refined and although it doesn’t express itself in any flourishing way, it is a design that is repeated and supported through the entire structure of the original building whereas Sealth did not have that. The elongation of slender columns creates a wonderful rhythm; infill panels are a poor choice but he believed that aspect is worth further consideration.

Mr. Martinson thought the precast and the way it is used is significant enough for nomination.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Nathan Hale High School at 10750 30th NE 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 buildings, and the site, excluding the following: the 2005 Performing Arts Center, the preschool building, the concessions building, the portables, and the sport field; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for August 6, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RM/VA

2:7:0 **Motion not approved.**
Messrs. Lee, Hannum, Veith, Mmes.
Tremaine, Strong, Nicolas, Howard
opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator