



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 64/21

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday February 3, 2021 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Roi Chang

Russell Coney

Matt Inpanbutr

Kristen Johnson

John Rodezno

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Jordan Kiel

Kristen Johnson, Acting Chair called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

In-person attendance is currently prohibited per Washington State Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28.5. Meeting participation is limited to access by the WebEx Event link or the telephone call-in line provided on the agenda.

ROLL CALL

020321.1

PUBLIC COMMENT

Marsha Seibertson said she has lived in La Quinta since 2013. She said the building and site have a strong presence in the area and its green space is a respite in the neighborhood. She said it is a central hub in the neighborhood. She supported nomination.

Rebecca Herzfeld and Gordon Crawford, spoke in support of nominating La Quinta; she said it meets criteria E and F. She said it is an outstanding work of Anhalt. It is one of six courtyard designs he did in the neighborhood and it is the only one in Spanish Eclectic style. She said the building is prominent in the neighborhood; she noted the location at the end of the block and its style. She said much established landscaping in the neighborhood has been demolished. She said the space is a community space and hosts block parties. She said the design is important.

Chelsea Bollen, La Quinta resident for 17 years said she loves the architecture and the courtyard. She said there is a vibrant community, and the spirit of community thrives; she noted Anhalt's care in designing the landscape / community space. She said they host neighborhood gathering nights which extends to the larger neighborhood. She noted the access to outdoor space from each of the units. She supported nomination.

Aaron Luoma, landscape architect and former chair of the Landmarks Board supported nomination. He said he visited the site and contributed to the analysis. He supported the Staff Report. He noted the integrity of the entry sequence, courtyard paths, perennial beds. He said remnants of the original landscaping may existing throughout the site. He said the space provides sanctuary from city life. He said courtyard apartments are important to the city.

Maria Jesus Silva said she is an architect from Chile and has been a resident of La Quinta since 2015. She said the architecture is exceptional and good architecture has a way of telling stories; she said this one does and it has a soul of its own. She said not just from the architectural details, courtyard, Spanish façades but an actual soul. She said the building creates bonds between resident and visitor. She cited the many community events and said the courtyard is the heart of the area with gardening, barbeques, and children playing.

Brandon Simmons, ten-year resident of La Quinta said the building is interesting architecturally. He noted the community at this building and the interaction with neighbors. He said it has always been a gathering space and the architecture facilitates that, intentionally as fundraiser, randomly when borrowing olive oil, and in caring for the many cats. He said everyone who comes experiences its magic. He said he wants this to be here in ten years.

Tom Heuser, Capitol Hill Historical Society said Anhalt is one of the best known names in architecture for his meticulously designed buildings. He said this one is exceptional: it is his first, an early courtyard apartment, and his only Spanish Eclectic. He said the building is an urban oasis in size and scale and it is worthy of nomination. He said he agrees with the Staff Report, criteria B, D, E, and F.

Lawrence Norman spoke in favor of nomination. He said his parents owned the building from 1964 – 1974 and he grew up there. He said the turret in Unit 9 felt like a castle and was a mystical experience. He said they demolished a wall between his unit and the one next door to house his parents’ business. He said the architecture brings people together and creates unique bonding. He said the garden is the place to move about. He said the courtyard faces south and provides great light and feel.

020321.2 MEETING MINUTES

January 6, 2021

MM/SC/HW/DB 6:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Chang abstained.

020321.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

020321.31 Daniel Bagley Elementary School
7821 Stone Way N. (*correcting published agenda*)
Request for Extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a nine-month extension. She said the school just completed a large rehabilitation and addition project which the board reviewed and approved.

Mr. Coney asked if a boiler plate for the school district was still in process.

Ms. Doherty said it is being worked on, still being tweaked. She said Loyal Heights’ document is close to being done and they hope to use it for a template. She said it is an extraordinarily difficult time right now for everybody.

Mr. Coney said a nine-month extension seems like a lot and suggested three-months.

Ms. Doherty said in absence of an agreement the board is reviewing more. She suggested six-months rather than three and noted it would be beneficial to all.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Daniel Bagley Elementary School, 7821 Stone Avenue N, for nine months.

MM/SC/RCO/JR 7:0:0 Motion carried.

020321.4 NOMINATION

020321.41 La Quinta Apartments
1710 E Denny Way

Ms. Doherty said the nomination was made by an outside party. She said she has been communicating with Gerald Littlefield the owner’s representative, and noted they are not making a presentation.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle said she was a co-applicant on the nomination. She thanked the residents, neighbors, and community members and noted the Viva La Quinta website. She thanked landscape architect Aaron Luoma for his work. She said the ownership is the estate of Ken Van Dyke who was the longtime owner and steward and contributed to the community there.

Katie Pratt, Northwest Vernacular provided context of the neighborhood and site. Streetcar lines connected Capitol Hill with downtown and increased development in the area. A line on Broadway began in 1891, followed by a line along Pike Street and 15th Avenue in 1901. James Moore platted the Capitol Hill Addition in 1902 and began actively promoting development on the hill. Over the next decade, three more streetcar lines increased access to Capitol Hill. Early construction within the neighborhood was mostly residential, with housing for the working, middle, and wealthy classes. Even the larger, more ornate residences built on Capitol Hill during this time—like those on “Millionaire’s Row” (14th Avenue E)—were typically built on small lots in comparison to the size of the homes on them, creating what historian Paul Dorpat described as “a community that feels both grand and intimate.” Water reservoirs—one in Volunteer Park and the Lincoln Reservoir—were completed in 1901 on Capitol Hill to provide critical support to the municipal water system. Lincoln Reservoir, located in present-day Cal Anderson Park, is a Seattle landmark and just a half mile west of the La Quinta Apartments.

Ms. Pratt said Seattle grew significantly in population during the first two decades of the twentieth century. This population boom increased demand for residential construction in the city, with numerous apartment buildings going up. The popularity of apartments reflected not only the city’s economic growth but changing social conditions. As more women left home and joined the work force, apartments afforded them respectable and affordable housing outside of the single room occupancy (SRO) hotels located downtown. Prior to 1923, the city did not maintain regulations on the location of apartment buildings, but for practicality they were typically constructed near downtown with easy access to streetcar lines. With its proximity to downtown and streetcar system, Capitol Hill and apartment buildings were marketed as worthy investments for real estate investors.

She said in 1923, the City of Seattle adopted a zoning ordinance to regulate land uses, including the form and location of new apartment buildings. The Second Residential zone allowed for apartment buildings and encircled downtown and included western Capitol Hill, where the La Quinta Apartments would be constructed. According to the 1936 Federal Housing Authority (FHA) color-coded map of Seattle, the area within which the La Quinta Apartments was constructed was ranked C-11. As a “C” ranking, the area was considered to be “definitely declining.” The specific description for the C-11 area simply stated that it was a “twilight” zone. Areas described as a twilight zone were considered in the process of deterioration, due to the “invasion” of nonwhite racial groups. The C-11 area was bordered by two “D” ranked areas to the south and east (D4 and D5), with D4 covering much of the Central District, Seattle’s historically Black neighborhood.

Ms. Pratt said many of the plats within Capitol Hill area were established before restrictive covenants became popular tools of land development companies to restrict who could access particular neighborhoods. However, during the 1920s, campaigns occurred throughout the city, including Capitol Hill, to prevent people of color from finding housing outside of specific neighborhoods.

She said in the midst of this population growth in Seattle and the rise of apartment buildings, the La Quinta was designed by Frederick Anhalt with architect William H. Whiteley preparing the permit and construction drawings for the Western Building and Leasing Company – which was owned by J. B. Hardcastle and Frederick Anhalt. Their company purchased the property at 17th Avenue E and E Denny Way in June 1927 from F. G. Guenther. Construction moved rapidly, reflecting their push to quickly turn a profit. The building was ready for rent in November and initially called “Anhalt Apartments.”

Ms. Pratt said Anhalt sold the building to an out-of-town buyer in late 1928. The next known owners of the building were Cyrus and Fannie Chandler, who lived in unit 8. The next known owner of the building was Anna Falkoff, who was a tenant by 1942 and purchased the apartment building in January 1943. She remained a La Quinta resident until 1954 when she moved into the renovated penthouse in her building at 1605 E Madison. Anna owned La Quinta for over 20 years. She owned at least three buildings by 1955.

She said Anna Falkoff led a fascinating life, immigrating to the U.S. from Russia in 1903 to escape the political and social upheaval of the Russian Revolution. She had two children and eventually made her way westward, settling at the utopian colony of Home in Pierce County by 1910. She lived in Home in the midst of the colony’s tension, as it divided into factions (the “nudes” and the “prudes,” reflecting the liberal and conservative thoughts in the village). Anna was apparently a member of the “nudes” side as she, along with many others, was fined for nude swimming (charges were later dropped). She left Home by 1914 to enroll at UW. By this point she was divorced, raising her two children alone and attending school full-time, all while working. She completed her four-year education program in three years, while also working on her high school diploma as the university would not award her a degree until she had finished high school. She worked in the university gardens, and also cultivated almost an acre of land at her home to feed her family as well as poor neighbors. She became a citizen in 1923 and pursued her master’s degree. By 1930, Anna had moved into apartment management.

Ms. Pratt said Falkoff had amassed enough wealth by the mid-1950s that she offered to sell the La Quinta apartments to help finance a new concert hall for the Seattle Symphony. But no one took her up on her offer.

Anna sold the apartment building for \$125,000 in 1964 to Richard Norman. Richard, a Black man originally from Mississippi, was an aeronautical engineer with Boeing. Richard’s son Lawrence shared that Richard may have worked around redlining practices by purchasing the property directly from Anna. In an email to the Viva La Quinta group, he said, “my dad had a knack for getting around racist boundaries.”

Ms. Pratt said Richard met Mildred Letherwood, a white computer programmer from Alabama, while working at Boeing in 1962. Richard and Mildred married in February 1965. And together they established their own business, Northwest Computing. Their company initially operated out of La Quinta—the Normans family lived in unit 9 and knocked down walls of the adjacent unit to support their operation. The company expanded and by 1969 had offices at 1250 Mercer Street. Unfortunately, their business success was short-lived due to the Boeing Bust and the cancellation of the supersonic transport (SST) program, and the business went bankrupt. According to the Normans' son, Lawrence, the couple owned the building from 1964 until 1974. The Normans owned other apartment buildings, in addition to the La Quinta Apartments, including the Queen Anne Apartments at 1635 Queen Anne Avenue.

Ms. Pratt said subsequent owners included Myron and Jane Kowals, then the Blakeley Walter Association in the late 1970s. The property was under new ownership, Kenneth Van Dyke, by 1982. Mr. Van Dyke passed away in February of 2020. He was born in Olympia to parents Edward and Adeline. He had a devout faith and sought a life of service – he spent 11 years at St. Edward's Seminary before turning to education. He then had a 40-year career at Lakeside School teaching Latin to students who knew him as KVD. In addition to his work in education, Mr. Van Dyke loved the arts. He was involved in the Seattle Opera, an avid patron of the Pacific NW Ballet, and a longtime member of Seattle Men's Chorus.

She said Frederick Anhalt, the designer of the apartments, was born in 1895 in Minnesota. He quit school at the age of 12 and eventually found work in butcher shops. With help from his father, he opened his own shop in Westby, Montana, when he was only seventeen. He expanded into the grocery market in 1916 before a 1917 fire put him out of business. After losing his business, he traveled throughout the Midwest and eventually ended up in the Pacific Northwest, arriving in Seattle in the mid-1920s.

Ms. Pratt said while working in Seattle, Anhalt met former butcher Jerry Hardcastle and together they went into the real estate business, forming Western Building and Leasing Company. They started specializing in building markets. They would work with an existing property owner, often using the owner's capital, to build markets and completely outfit them, before selling them for profit. Anhalt and Hardcastle got into apartment building as they started to build apartments behind the markets to provide close housing to the new markets.

As they moved into apartment construction, they started to take control of the entire process, hiring an architect to prepare permit and construction drawings and a crew to construct them. After their first few projects, they brought on William H. Whiteley as their architect, with whom Anhalt had worked on his early market designs. La Quinta was Whiteley's first non-commercial design with the company. It became clear that there was money in apartment construction, but more money if they could be built bigger, faster, and higher quality. Anhalt also recognized the importance of atmosphere and views with higher end apartment buildings but

understood that a scenic view out from an apartment could be immediately changed by new construction, affecting the property's value.

Ms. Pratt said Anhalt had John Dofsen landscape the grounds of his apartment building projects. According to Anhalt, the La Quinta was the first apartment building they constructed with the landscape emphasis. Larry Kreisman, who authored a book on Anhalt and is a well-known historian in Seattle, stated: Anhalt bought out his partner Hardcastle in 1928. And his business, renamed the Anhalt Company, boomed and expanded over the next couple years. He often had two or three buildings underway at one time, keeping his crew in work. His management and drive pushed his projects forward at incredible speed, many taking less than 90 days to complete.

She said the stock market crash in 1929 sank Anhalt's business, though. He financed his projects through mortgages and then intended to sell them to other investors once they were finished, like he did with the La Quinta. However, in the lead-up to the crash, Anhalt had difficulty finding buyers as the stock market soared, with investors choosing stocks over real estate investment. This led him to sell 49% of his company in 1928 in exchange for 49% of the stock in the U.S. Bond and Mortgage Company. Now owning a mortgage company, he took out second mortgages on all his properties. When the market crashed, Anhalt lost a million dollars and filed for bankruptcy.

Ms. Pratt said Anhalt returned to designing and building housing in 1932, this time low-cost housing. He then formed a brief partnership with William Whiteley between 1934 and 1936. Anhalt completed a handful of projects over the next several years, but never at the scale or financial exposure of his previous projects. He purchased a nursery business near the University of Washington in 1937, which he operated until 1973, when he sold it to the university. Anhalt was made an AIA Seattle Honorary Member in 1993. He died in 1996.

She said there are a number of extant Anhalt apartment buildings including those converted to condominiums in Seattle of which she provided a map and photos. She said they are just a sampling of his work – showing how his properties got quite large towards the end. A number are local landmarks, and two are contributing properties in the Harvard-Belmont Landmark District.

- 1710 E Denny Way (1927), La Quinta Apartments (subject property)
- 1320 Queen Avenue N (ca. 1927), Barcelona Court
- 906 1st Avenue W (ca. 1927), Seville Court
- 711 NE 43rd Street (1928), Anhalt Hall/Acacia Apartment, Seattle landmark
- 1405 E John Street (1928), Pallas Colline Apartments/Anhalt Arms
- 2205 Bigelow Avenue N (ca. 1928), converted to condominiums
- 1746 S Hanford Street (ca. 1928), bungalow court
- 417 Harvard Avenue E (1928-29), with the Borchert Company. Designed and built by Western Building & Leasing Company
- 730 Belmont Avenue E (1929), Oak Manor, contributing to the Harvard-Belmont Landmark District

- 750 Belmont Avenue E (ca. 1929, contributing to the Harvard-Belmont Landmark District), converted to condominiums
- 1516 E Republican Street (ca. 1929), converted to condominiums
- 1201 E John Street (ca. 1929), converted to condominiums
- 111 14th Avenue E (ca. 1929), converted to condominiums
- 1005 E Roy Street (1930), Anhalt Apartments, Seattle landmark
- 1014 E Roy Street (1930), Seattle landmark
- 721 Boylston Avenue E (also 710 Belmont Place E, 1930-31), The Belmont
- 2020 43rd Avenue E (Anhalt worked on an addition to the existing ca. 1922 Lake Court Apartments)
- 1600 E John Street (1930-31), Seattle landmark and National Register and Washington Heritage Register listed

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular provided a map showing the La Quinta in the south-central portion of the Capitol Hill neighborhood, as well as surrounding landmarked properties. He said the building's location is roughly halfway between downtown and Lake Washington, just north of the Central District neighborhood, and less than a mile south of Volunteer Park. Buildings within the immediate area consist predominately of apartments, including former single-family residences converted to apartment use. Landscape as exterior spaces for the building's community is a major aspect of the La Quinta residential experience. The courtyard provides an important semi-public space for apartment community use and gatherings that transitions between the public street and the private apartment units.

He said the overall design and plant selection based on historic photographs and remaining original plantings reflects a Mediterranean style utilizing evergreen rather than deciduous plants that complement the building's colors and material textures. The upper right photograph shows the central courtyard and overlooking upper balconies. The smaller photograph shows the Yews, attributed as original, at the front gate and trained to merge above the gate as part of the entrance. The building's wood frame structure is clad with painted stucco having a rough troweled texture. The building's windows remain intact, with protective exterior vinyl storm windows.

Decorative design elements, visible in the lower right photo, occur at the center of the south facade of the two wings and at the two arched entrances on the south side of the building's central portion.

He said the courtyard and backyard collectively comprise over 40-percent of the parcel square footage. They reflect, as described in Mimi Sheridan's National Register of Historic Places MPD for "Seattle Apartment Buildings," developer Frederick Anhalt's "emphasis on landscaped courtyards as a refuge" and desire to provide views for tenants regardless of neighboring construction patterns with each apartment unit stacked vertically to provide for tenant space without diminishing the individual unit access to the courtyard and the back yard. Tall leaded lite casement windows provide views out to the courtyard. Second story balconies and sunrooms afford private spaces overlooking the courtyard and the back yard, while also supporting an extension of greenery beyond the courtyard into private spaces

through hanging and potted plants. The courtyard is a significant central feature. Its spatial organization consists of a single original gated entrance from the street centered on the south side. Original walkways branch to either side and extend around the perimeter of the open space, which was designed with a central specimen tree. Original planting beds occur along the building foundation, at the outer corners of the central space, and along the south edge of the courtyard. The courtyard topography remains level with central lawn.

Mr. Howard said the lawn is an original feature and comprises most of the space extending between the perimeter walkways below the central Deodar Cedar. The cedar is a replacement of the original specimen tree. It is important to understand that there are no internal corridors. Each two-story unit has its own access to the courtyard and its own balcony and its own street or alley access. There are 13 units with four in each wing, four in the central portion, and a studio above the garage off the northeast corner. Individual unit layout varies based on the number of rooms. Generally, the first floor contains the living and dining rooms, and the kitchen. A stairway connects to the second-floor bedroom and bathroom with a short hallway linking these second-floor spaces. Access to the balconies and sun porches is through the second-floor bedroom.

Mr. Howard said the second-floor hallways typically have built in cabinets for linen storage. Interior finishes generally consist of painted plaster walls and cove ceilings with painted wood baseboards, picture moldings, and casings at openings. Open uncased doorways between living and dining areas have elliptical arched headers. Flooring consists of fir, maple, and oak; tile in the bathrooms; and added linoleum and vinyl typically in kitchens and some new tile work in bathrooms. Stairways consist of straight-run and quarter-turn variations and are located along party walls off the front entrance.

He said decorative fireplaces serve as an important visual feature within living rooms of all but two (unit 8 and the studio). An electrical outlet at each unit enables plugging in an insert for visual effect and some ambient heat. Sleeping porches enclose the balconies at the south end of the wings. Each porch consists of leaded windows set between slender mullions. Painted bead board clads the ceiling and inner face of the outer walls.

Mr. Barnes asked if the walls removed from Number 10 were reinstated.

Mr. Howard wasn't sure and noted he wasn't able to view it.

Mr. Barnes asked if the tiling was original.

Mr. Howard said in the units they could see, they are. He noted extant stairways, ceiling casing, and fireplaces and said there is no count on how many units have tile.

Resident Chelsea Bollen said some bathroom tile is original and some have had light rehabilitation to tile. She said the knocked-out wall was reinstated.

Mr. Rodezno asked if there were any major alterations to the building besides the demolished wall.

Mr. Howard said the interior and exterior are highly intact. In the 1950s a bathroom was added to the first story at the northwest corner. He said the vinyl storm windows are installed over the original windows.

Ms. Chang asked if the sunrooms were original.

Mr. Howard said the two sleeping porches are original and exhibit leaded windows, and beadboard.

Ms. Chang asked if the garage is a late addition and if it is included.

Mr. Howard said the studio and attached garage are original to the building. The detached garage is a 1950 addition. He said the backyard is significant as a landscaped space with central apartment units having access to it.

Ms. Chang asked how the yard is shared.

Resident Chelsea Bollen said the same owner owns the two houses behind the building and all residents share the yard and garden space.

Mr. Howard said the backyard is within the legal parcel boundaries.

Mr. Coney asked if the site is nominated should the detached garage be excluded.

Ms. Doherty said the north corner addition is part of the main building and included. She said she took the legal description off the nomination application. She said the Staff Report includes the whole site, including the backyard that Mr. Howard clarified. She did not include the detached garage in the staff report. She recommended that they be clear if they want to include it.

Mr. Coney asked if the complete legal description is included.

Mr. Howard said they used the legal description for the full parcel.

Ms. Pratt said on Assessor site, the parcel includes the backyard and lot.

Mr. Barnes said he supported nomination and noted the architecture, uniqueness, and significance of community benefits. He said the building is special and unique in the neighborhood.

Ms. Wasserman supported nomination and noted she has walked by and admired the building. She said it is an early Anhalt and the style is unusual for the area.

Mr. Rodezno supported nomination and said the building is unique and special. He noted the courtyard and mature landscape. He said there are no interior corridors, and each unit is two-levels. He noted the La Quinta residents support nomination.

Mr. Inpanbutr supported nomination and said he appreciated public comments and the Viva La Quinta website. He said it was fun to hear the stories. He agreed with the Staff Report and said criteria B, D, E are relevant.

Ms. Chang supported nomination and said she had been in the building just once many years ago and remembers it. She noted the distinctiveness of the structure and said the layout is unique with courtyard. She noted the eclectic style. She wanted further discussion of the criteria.

Mr. Coney appreciated the presentation and gave kudos to the residents, past residents, and website. He said he is reminded of the Roy Vue Apartments designation in resident and community support. He noted the Spanish Eclectic architecture and the original interior work. He said the quality has lasted; it was quality built. He said he was glad the building had not been modified or disgraced by remodel. He supported nomination and noted concern about the neighborhood; nearby landmarks, the Galbraith and Sullivan houses were demolished.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and noted the community support. She said it is a secret garden in a way the way it is landscaped. She said she wanted further discussion of the criteria, specifically D. She said the character of the landscape and the building together is significant.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the La Quinta Apartments at 1710 E Denny Way 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 March 17, 2021; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/JR/RCO 7:0:0 Motion carried.

020321.5 BRIEFING

020321.51 Baker Linen Building
1101 E. Pike Street
Briefing on proposed rehabilitation and penthouse addition

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary appreciated the opportunity to brief the full board and hear everyone's thoughts on the proposed addition. She said they are not going to the full zone height and the buildings surrounding this one are in common ownership. She said the addition will be modest and she noted the need to bring the building up to current seismic standards so it can last another hundred years.

Kirsten Wild explained that 1101 E. Pike Street / Baker Linen Building, is a masonry commercial building located at the southeast corner of 11th Avenue and East Pine Street, in the Capitol Hill neighborhood. The Baker Linen Building was built in 1915-16 as an automobile showroom, garage and service building, fitting squarely within the uses that distinguished the area known as “Auto Row”. It was designed by Architect Sønke Engelhart Sønnichsen for Owner Mary Liebeck. The property is within the City of Seattle Pike/Pine Urban Center Village and the Pike/Pine Conservation Overlay District. The existing historic building is three stories over a basement, with a mezzanine located between the ground floor and second floor, and a penthouse at the southwest corner serving the freight elevator overrun.

In recent decades, the historic building has been re-roofed, parapet bracing was added, and repairs were made following the Nisqually Earthquake in 2001, but the unreinforced masonry building is overdue for a full seismic upgrade and improvements to the building’s mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems are needed. These seismic and systems upgrades provide a good opportunity for the Owner, Pike Baker Linen LLC, to update the core circulation and build an addition at the roof level to take advantage of the increased density and changed economics of the area, providing additional rental income to help cover the cost of the upgrades. The proposed project maintains the commercial use of the building, with retail at the ground floor and mezzanine levels, and office spaces at the floors above, while adding two stories of additional office space and updating core circulation elements to provide code-compliant stair egress and modern elevator service. Although the zoning would allow for additional height to 85’ above the Average Grade Level, which could accommodate up to 4 additional stories, the proposed massing strategies limit new work to two floors. The reasons for this are: 1) to not visually overwhelm the existing building, 2) to stay slightly lower than the adjacent buildings, and 3) to not block the public view deck of the neighboring building to the east. Option 1 proposes two new stories set back by half of the existing structural bay from the street elevations, or approximately 9’-6” from the north and west property lines. Option 2 proposes a 4th floor gasket level set back from the north and west elevations by 5’-0” with the 5th floor set back the depth of the parapet wall.

She requested input on the massing strategy and guidance on the proposed interventions at the existing facades.

She proposed removing the existing freight elevator at the southwest floor and infilling the floor. She proposed inserting a sheer wall along the east wall. She went over photos of the building from 1916, 1937, and 2020 and noted how little has changed. She noted the curved corner entry. The Baker Linen Building was built in 1915-16 for use as an automobile showroom, garage and service building. The primary structure is heavy timber construction with concrete foundation walls and column piers. The exterior walls are load-bearing brick masonry. From the exterior, the building retains much of its original character, which is defined by reddish brown brick pilasters and tan brick spandrels, both inset with white tile decorative elements. A curved entry at the corner of 11th and E. Pine serves the primary ground floor commercial space – originally the automobile showroom. Existing

changes to the building include the loss of light fixtures that once marked the inset panels at the 2nd floor level of the pilasters, replacement of large plate glass windows at the ground floor with divided painted wood windows (and a door at the east side of the north elevation), painted aluminum storefront doors and sidelights replacing the original corner entry doors, and revisions at the two southern-most ground-floor bays at the west elevation. The brick at the north and east walls of the penthouse is currently clad with fiber cement panels, and the south elevation was replaced with vertical seam galvanized metal siding following the 2001 Nisqually earthquake.

Ms. Wild went over proposed alterations including upgrades to seismic and life safety systems and exterior upgrades. She proposed adding a storefront and entry where elevator is removed. She proposed a recessed entry and vestibule on the north entry. On the south/alley side, she proposed infilling two doors no longer in use. The east elevation is a party wall; windows are boarded up from inside and will be filled with fire rated infill.

Ms. Wild provided a comparison of the proposed massing option with what is possible by Zoning Code. The preferred option is Option 1 which provides a limited increase in rentable area but enough to make renovations possible.

Ms. Clawson said they are early in the process and would like feedback on massing.

Mr. Coney thanked the team for their commitment to restoring old buildings. He noted the thought and imagination that went into creating Chophouse Alley. He said the seismic seems fine and the storefront changes are nicely done. He said it was nice to see the maximum envelope allowed compared to options. He noted REI was pushed back and asked how far Option 1 is pulled back.

Ms. Wild said 9'6" and noted it is not a large building, it is only four bays wide.

Mr. Coney said the new building to the south is stepped back and suggested going up to three stories but step back more.

Liz Dunn said Chophouse only steps back about 10'.

Mr. Coney said he likes the plan in general.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated the presentation and drawings and photos that provided true views.

Mr. Barnes asked why they rounded corner was not continued on addition.

Ms. Wild said it provides differentiation between old and new and is cleaner.

Mr. Barnes said the building across the street has rounded corner and that he would like to see that continuation.

Ms. Johnson said a new sharp corner will differentiate the new from the old. She said the changes to the storefront and base are appropriate. She said Option 1 fits with the scale. She said it is a striking building.

Mr. Inpanbutr agreed with Ms. Johnson and said the project is going in the right direction in pulling away from the parapet and differentiating new from old.

Ms. Dunn corrected her earlier statement and said Chophouse sets back 15'. She said this building is tiny, so a setback is a big percentage of that. She said it would be challenging to set it back anymore.

Ms. Chang said in thinking about overall heights of building and adjacent buildings she wondered if retention of the old freight elevator was considered.

Ms. Wild said keeping the old freight elevator is problematic in that when it is removed the area will be infilled with sheer diaphragm that connects corner of building to rest of the façade. She said the façade of the elevator penthouse is being maintained.

Mr. Rodezno appreciated the work thus far and asked how the new addition will interact with adjacent contemporary buildings. He said it will be nice to see existing openings carried through to new addition to respect the site and the landmark.

Mr. Coney asked future plans for building.

Ms. Wild said it will house offices.

Mr. Kiel said it is in keeping with the neighborhood and will provide more commercial daytime uses.

Mr. Coney said they are headed in the right direction and he appreciated the iterations.

Ms. Clawson said more details will come with the storefront and elevator overrun.

Ms. Johnson said she echoed Mr. Coney's comments.

020321.6

STAFF REPORT

There was no staff report.

Mr. Barnes asked about differentiation on new building additions.

Ms. Johnson said in general it is based on National Park Service Standards for Rehabilitation. She said the intent is to differentiate new from old but that every project is different. She said generally options are provided and that is where board discusses it.

Mr. Coney said the right angle should have more softness to it and better plays off the curve.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator