



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 727/14

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, December 3, 2014 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Robert Ketcherside
Aaron Luoma
Sarah Shadid
Matthew Sneddon
Marie Strong
Alison Walker Brems, Chair
Elaine Wine

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Linda Amato
Jeffrey Murdock
Valerie Porter

Chair Alison Walker Brems called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

120314.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
November 5, 2014
MM/SC/DB/NC 8:0:0 Minutes approved.

120314.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

120314.21 Green Lake Library

7364 East Green Lake Drive North
Proposed removal of one tree

Matt Inbatputr explained that due to installation of a new sewer line a couple trees need to be removed; one will be replanted and the other will be replaced in-kind. He said an arborist reviewed the Cherry and said it was in fair condition with some pest damage.

Mr. Ketcherside arrived at 3:32 pm.

Mr. Luoma asked if they looked in to abandoning and rerouting the sewer line.

Mr. Inbanputr responded that is what they are doing.

Ms. Doherty said that alternate routes were explored and determined that all scenarios would create stress for that tree, which is already unhealthy.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said that the cherry tree is susceptible to a lot of disease. He said it is unfortunate because it is large, and that due to its size any routing would probably cause stress to the tree. He supported what was proposed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed utility work and associated tree removal /replacement at Green Lake Library, 7364 East Green Lake Drive North, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed tree removal will adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121106. However, it is understood that the demonstrated need to replace the utility line will likely damage the tree, and that the tree currently shows diminished health has been documented by a Certified Arborist. Per the Certified Arborist, the second tree may be safely removed, protected and replanted.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/NC/MS 9:0:0 Motion carried.

120314.22

Volunteer Park
1400 E. Prospect Street
Proposed removal of two trees

Kathleen Conner, DOPAR, explained the proposed removal of two trees and said they are working on a plan to bring back the original Olmsted plan to the park along with some added materials. She said that a self-sown Mazano Cherry will be removed because it is shading the garden. She said an old Yoshino Cherry will be removed due to water intrusion, damage to tree that is a hazard. She said they have a self-imposed restriction on planting trees until their planting program is implemented; she said they will follow the two for one planting policy.

Responding to questions DOPAR said that depending on whether in lawn or in a bid they generally remove the stump by grinding out.

Ms. Conner explained that they know the Mazano tree is self-sown because they have planting as-builts and neither the Mazano nor the Yoshino are on the list.

Ms. Barker asked about the policy for volunteer trees.

Ms. Conner said it depends on where it is. She said that now that they're planning to get back to more of the Olmsted plan, the approach will be more formal than it has been.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about gift trees made to Seattle from other cities and how they are recognized.

Ms. Conner said that some have plaques; they have some that go back 90 years.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Doherty explained that there was no ARC review and this came straight to the board because one tree is deemed potentially hazardous.

Mr. Luoma said he had no issue. He said that Volunteer Park is a very special park, and to continuing to maintain it and get back to the Olmsted Plan is good. He said that DOPAR has been a good steward of the park.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed tree removal at Volunteer Park, 1400 E. Prospect Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed tree removal will not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation; LPB 498/11. Per the Certified Arborist's assessment, one tree has been identified as invasive and in conflict with the vegetation management plan, and the second tree has been identified as unhealthy and potentially hazardous.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/MS/AL 9:0:0 Motion carried.

120314.23

The Rainier Club
820 Fourth Avenue
Proposed addition and site alteration

John Savo, NBBJ, provided brief history of the building and explained the intent to preserve its integrity while adjacent demolition and construction are ongoing. He said that that alterations will be made to the auto court, site wall and existing trees will be removed. He said that the proposed addition was approved in 2008 but the project was delayed due to the economic downturn. He said that in the interim improvements were made to the design that have lessened impact to the building.

He said that a new site wall will be added around the garage, a canopy added to the south entry, the new underground garage structure will be connected to the new tower but will serve the Rainier Club. He said the new canopy will allow light through. He said that the new structure is distinguished from the landmarked structure and doesn't call attention to itself; it allows the landmark primacy. He noted the alignment with the base of the club and said the materials are a nod to the original.

He said that the current site wall is taller than a person and the new wall will be a bit taller. He said that ARC asked to see perspective drawing from street level and to mitigate the impact of the wall on the pedestrian space. He said they setback the planter 8" to maintain the existing height; the planter is taller but it is set back. He said that the guard rail is pushed back 12" so now it is 20" back. He said they changed the material to limestone and is more like a trim element. He said it provides improved screening of the auto court.

He said that the mechanical exhaust from the garage will appear as a grading in the landscape with planting around to screen it. He said it won't encroach on or impeded views of the building. He said they will replace trees with Japanese Maples and Cypress and residential character plantings that are in keeping with the residential character of the historic building.

Mr. Savo said that the existing canopy – installed in 1965 - is thick and opaque and casts a shadow over the entry. He said they will lighten it and

slim it down and use translucent glass. He said attachments will be at the existing locations and there will be no new impacts to the building.

He said that lighting will be pedestrian scale pole lights, flush mount fixtures in auto court, and light will spill out from the lobby. He said that one light pole on Columbia will be relocated to 4th Avenue where there are others of the same type. He said that there will be no alterations to the building nor will it be touched.

Louisa Chang went over material palette and said terracotta will be ordered in a range so it won't have a flat look. She said that limestone will be used on site walls and for trim. She provided material samples and said canopy glass will be translucent. She said that there will be no directionality to the cobblestones.

Ms. Barker asked the corner wall height.

Tom Henry said it will be 7'8".

Ms. Wine disclosed that she is working with John Savo on another project.

Mr. Sneddon asked when the wall was installed and Mr. Savo said he didn't know.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if the planters will be deep enough.

Mr. Savo explained that they are working with a landscape architect.

Ms. Barker asked about the pedestrian corridor at the outer edges of the only public sidewalk.

Mr. Savo said it will be same as now.

Ms. Walker Brems asked about design of the guard rail.

Mr. Henry said it will be 2" wide and 1/4" thick, painted flat bar bronze. He said it will be unobtrusive.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the 1965-66 project was the first time autos were factored into design.

Todd Rauch said it was.

Mr. Luoma asked why there would be so much paved area now that they would have a garage.

Ms. Chang said they use it for social functions and sometimes parking. She said it is a multi-use space.

Mr. Luoma asked what led to the material choices.

Mr. Savo said they looked for texture and something that would be a less typical parking lot. He said that they wanted cobbles that recall Pike Place Market and Pioneer Square Historic districts. He said that with regard to the wall they just tried to match the original brick; it is close but not a match.

Ms. Walker Brems asked about the site wall on the north side of the building.

Mr. Savo said they are doing work only on the portion adjacent to the new construction. He said the old and new site walls are different.

Ms. Chang said there is a clear delineation between new and old.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine said that there was no impact to the historic building with the site wall, auto court and entry to garage and no major impact with the new canopy structure. She said the applicant provided additional information requested by ARC.

Ms. Barker said they did a good job of lessening/eliminating impact to the historic building. She said she had reservations about the new wall adjacent to the corner of the right of way. She said they need to reinforce the horizontal nature of the new addition and that she prefers a more horizontal focus.

Ms. Wine said she isn't sure how they could achieve that on a long plane.

Ms. Barker said a scoring pattern emphasized by white/cream façade.

Mr. Ketcherside said that the bricks on the wall are now small scale and the new will be larger scoring modern wall; he said the loss is the small scale nature of that.

Mr. Luoma said he was afraid the glazed lobby area will shine like a beacon.

Ms. Wine said that the proposal is appropriate and she looks for differentiation.

Ms. Barker said it is tucked back and responds and relates to the new addition; it is not real visible.

Ms. Walker Brems said that the use of material does echo the horizontal striation elegantly and is a modern intervention and is part of the charm of the space. She said the canopy with its glass top is very modern and touches the building but she wouldn't object to it.

Ms. Barker said it is a nice addition and will provide more light.

Mr. Luoma said he wasn't sure they have appropriate soil depth and said to keep in mind shrubs need 2' and trees need 3'.

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

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 113459, as the proposed addition and associated site alterations 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 proposed design also meets Standard #10, which states that new additions "shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/NC/AL 9:0:0 Motion carried.

120314.3 NOMINATION

120314.31 Waldo Sanatorium / Waldo Hospital
8511 15th Avenue NE

David Miller and Donna Miller, Maple Leaf community council representatives, prepared and presented a nomination report (full report in DON file). Mr. Miller said that the building is worthy of designation based on Dr. Waldo's significance – locally, regionally and nationally – and its association with the history of osteopathy. He said the hospital contributed to the distinctive identity of Maple Leaf which grew up around the site. He said that criteria C and F are met and noted Waldo's association with the history of osteopathy which played a role in the siting and design of the hospital. He said he has 1300 signatures supporting designation.

Mr. Miller said that Dr. Waldo and the building are also associated with the advancement of alternative medicine. He explained the tension between allopathic versus osteopathic care and the role Waldo played in the standardization, professionalism, and teaching of osteopathy. He said that Waldo had a significant and lasting effect on osteopathy. He said that Dr. Waldo provided free Saturday services for the needy and free treatment for high school athletes. He said that the hospital was a meeting place for osteopaths and a place for naturopath residencies. He stressed the importance of recognizing Dr. Waldo and the role the site has played in the Maple Leaf community. He said he was open to working with all on memorializing Dr. Waldo.

Mr. Luoma noted Waldo's many involvements.

Mr. Miller said that he was a champion for osteopathic care at a time when it was viewed with skepticism. He was a community volunteer. He said that it was a testament to his character that he would let the perception of what he did get in the way of good works. He said that Waldo transcended the perception and was forward thinking.

Ms. Barker asked why the hospital moved from the site after Waldo died.

Mr. Miller said it was the economics of bringing the building up to code.

Ms. Wine noted the integrity of the building and the modifications made by Campfire Association.

Mr. Miller said the integrity of the building is an open question. He said the community wants to honor Dr. Waldo's legacy.

Larry Johnson prepared and presented a second nomination report, on behalf of the owner (full detail report in DON file). He provided context of the site and neighborhood and went over integrity issues including dry rot on the front entry portico, elements – leaded glass windows - stripped from building, and solarium removed. He said that the original entrance on the 1924 building was from the east and when autos became more common the entry was switched to the west side of the building with the addition of a paved parking area. He said that the interior has been gutted. He said that the 1959 renovation was financed by selling the clinic building to the northeast.

Mr. Johnson said that the building did not meet any of the criteria for designation. He said that while Dr. Waldo was one of Seattle's well-known osteopaths, the structure can't convey that, or even that it was a hospital. He noted that two of Seattle's founders were doctors, and noted the founders of Providence, Swedish, Bastyr, and Hope Heart Center at Providence. He said that the building was not an outstanding example of its style, nor of the

architect Paul Richardson's work. He said that the building has limited visibility through trees and has no integrity. He said that the adjacent Waldo Woods to the east of the building is preserved under a conservation easement.

John Mills, Greenwood Equity, said the building is vacant and derelict and a victim of vandalism. He said they want to use the site for a new senior living facility.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary, said that no new information was presented since the last time the building was nominated except for significant changes to the site and building. She said the woods will be preserved. She said the building doesn't have enough integrity.

Public Comment:

Rob Stevens, area resident, said he did not support nomination and that development was a better use of the site.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker supported nomination on criteria B and C and said that the original building still has integrity of expression and vision. She said that the 1950s addition is problematic.

Mr. Carter did not support nomination. He said that Waldo was significant but the hospital moved out in the 1960s. He said the building has lost integrity and can't convey its significance.

Mr. Ketcherside would not likely support nomination. He said the original design was more clearly a hospital but there is not enough integrity. He said that there is only the woods section, and not enough to nominate the site.

Mr. Luoma said that Waldo was significant and the nomination in 2007 would have been an easier decision. He noted the intention to provide a healing quality space in a more rural and pastoral site – associated with osteopathic philosophy. He said the north portion of the original site with new townhouses, and the 1959 building addition detract from the integrity. He did not support nomination.

Ms. Shadid agreed with Messrs. Ketcherside and Luoma and did not support nomination. She said the 1959 alterations significantly changed the look and feel of the building and there is not enough integrity. She said that Dr. Waldo was significant and could have met Criterion B.

Mr. Sneddon said that the site can tell us a lot. He supported nomination on criteria B, C, and F. He said the divergence between allopathy and osteopathy

is compelling and significant. He said that the building represents the vanishing breed of the sanatorium. He said he wasn't concerned with integrity issues because of the direct association with Dr. Waldo's input on design, location, practice etc.

Ms. Strong said she appreciated the community presentation and research. She did not support nomination noting the negative impact of the 1959 addition and the current stripped-down condition. She said there is too much loss of integrity.

Ms. Wine said she was 'on the fence' – Dr. Waldo is significant, and without him the integrity issues knock this out of nomination viability. She questioned if there was enough of the building there to convey this, and noted that it does. She said it is an unusual building in a residential zone. She supported nomination.

Ms. Walker Brems said that Dr. Waldo was significant but she can't get past the integrity issues and the NBBJ addition.

Action I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Waldo Sanatorium / Waldo Hospital at 8511 15th Avenue 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 site; and the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for January 21, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/DB/AL 4:5:0 Motion failed. Mmes. Strong, Walker Brems, Shadid, Messrs. Carter and Ketcherside opposed.

Mr. Carter left at 6:15 pm.

120314.4 BRIEFINGS

120314.41 901 Harrison Street
Briefing on proposed rehabilitation and new construction

PowerPoint in DON file.

Jack McCullough explained Design Review had blessed the design and they were looking for board input.

Jennifer Summer provided context of the site and said they plan to keep the north façade and demolish the south side warehouse. She said that boarded windows on the east elevation will be opened up. She said that they will clean and paint the steel sash on the north elevation and replace mezzanine clerestory with new board form

concrete. She said that they propose to remove gate and replace window with similar steel on the south elevation.

She said that where the tower will hit the landmark the massing is not changed and provided color studies that show how they will highlight distinctive features of the landmark. She showed the stepping from the landmark to the podium and said the tower entry is set back to allow the landmark to sit proud. She went over the evolution of the tower massing design. She said there will be retail areas at the ground level and said the entry will be right between the old and new. She said the entry will be glassy and transparent.

Mr. McCullough said that ARC provided helpful comments.

Ms. Wine said that times have changed and that is shown in the scale of the landmark and the new building. She said the materials choices are a nice backdrop. She said the heavy mullion between windows loses the thinness of steel sash.

Ms. Sodt said that question also came up at ARC.

Ms. Summer said they can tweak that.

Ms. Barker asked about parking garage and demolition and excavation issues.

Ms. Sodt said that was also discussed at ARC.

Ms. Barker said she likes the lighter color on the landmark so it doesn't disappear and she appreciates the design tweaks to the tower.

Mr. Ketcherside said the tower is great and draws people in to the pleasant surprise of the landmark. He said it is fantastic.

Ms. Walker Brems said it is an exciting design and noted the contrast of the podium base to the landmark. She said it provides a lively pedestrian street experience.

Mr. Ketcherside said the street experience looks good.

Mr. Luoma asked about glazing.

Mr. Summer said they are exploring clear glazing.

Ms. Strong said it was a good job and very nice.

Mr. Sneddon said he was glad they are preserving the fenestration.

120314.42

Pac-Med / U.S. Marine Hospital
1200 12th Avenue South
Briefing on proposed replacement of windows

Window survey and detailed packet in DON file.

Ms. Doherty explained that the building was landmarked in 1989 and went over the areas of control. She said that there are various window types in different parts of the building.

Peter Meijer said they sought input on full window replacement. He provided a brief overview of the condition assessment; he said that the building has languished over 20 years and suffered from benign neglect. He said the windows are old and don't contribute to the key character defining features of building. He said that the wood windows are background and the former steel windows are the key. He explained their proposal to replace all windows with aluminum and match the wood and steel profiles. He said the windows in the best condition are on the north side.

He provided plastic 3-D printed examples of the original wood and steel profiles, and showed samples of the proposed glass versus the existing. He said that they are not happy with the replacement profile for the steel windows yet and will continue working with the manufacturer. He said that the existing windows contribute to weathering problems and degradation of the masonry.

Ms. Walker Brems asked about locations of the original steel windows.

Mr. Meijer clarified that sheet A5 provides that information.

Ms. Wine recapped the ARC briefing and asked how the applicant was addressing the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. She asked if there are precedents for full building replacements – over 800 windows. She asked if they had considered other options such as re-using windows in moderate shape.

Mr. Meijer said they are considering repairing the north façade wood windows and possibly bringing others from other elevations. They are still looking at precedents.

Ms. Walker Brems asked about the nomination.

Ms. Doherty clarified that it's not unusual for the nomination reports from that era – 1989 – to be somewhat brief, so not identifying windows specifically does not seem unusual. She said the entire exterior is controlled; this includes the windows.

Ms. Barker asked if they've spoken with the National Park Service for precedents, rather than conferring with a window manufacturer.

Mr. Meijer said they are seeking historic tax credits and will talk with the National Park Services. They have not asked them about precedents.

Ms. Wine read from the Secretary of Interior Standards #s 2 and 6. She said that there are over 800 windows and half are in moderate condition. She said that per the SOI even poor condition should be repaired, and if that were the case, over half wouldn't need replacement. She said it would set a huge precedent to lose all of these windows. She said she visited the building and that the windows offer significant character and much of the glazing is original and has an amazing quality. She said the presence of the historic character and glazing is impressive, especially as seen from the south elevation. She said it's not replaceable fabric.

Ms. Walker Brems agreed with Ms. Wine. She said she went to the building and said it is amazing. She said it is incredible to have a building of this scale with large wood windows, and noted that 53% are in great shape, even if they were used for cost savings in the original design.

Ms. Barker said the pie chart presented is very clear and a lot of windows are not in poor condition, and she supports finding alternatives and to get away from 100% replacement.

Mr. Meijer said they will look at trying to retain them on the north, and said the sash pockets are built into the wall and difficult to work with. He said that the distribution of 'poor' on elevation exposed to weather.

Ms. Walker Brems said a proposal is needed for more specific feedback.

Ms. Barker asked if they can preserve 1/3 of the moderate windows.

Mr. Meijer said there would be a hodge podge appearance.

Mr. Sneddon said that having one cohesive glazing will look closer to original. He appreciated the proposal to recreate the original window frame and sash profiles. He said that replacement will help preserve the intractable issues with masonry. He said that there would be heavy retention and reinstallation of wood on the north elevation.

Ms. Walker Brems wanted more information about the masonry degradation. She asked about DAHP and Fed thoughts on the proposal.

Mr. Meijer said they have initiated the conversation.

Ms. Wine said the south façade is breath taking. She said there is more of a view of original materials on the south façade and she wants more compelling information on why the existing windows can't be repaired. She said the north façade is more fragmented.

Ms. Walker Brems said the original design had three different window types – bronze, wood, and steel - and that texture adds to the character.

Ms. Doherty asked the board to clarify if they are okay with replacing the non-historic aluminum windows to replicate original steel with new aluminum windows: they said 'yes'. She asked if their issues are more about how to address the wood windows: they said 'yes'.

120314.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator