



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 775/18

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday December 5, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Kathleen Durham

Rich Freitas

Alan Guo

Garrett Hodgins

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Genna Nashem

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Manish Chalana

Russell Coney

Steven Treffers

Vice-Chair Deb Barker called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**120518.1**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

September 19, 2018

MM/SC/KJ/GH

6:0:0 Minutes approved.

**120518.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION**

120518.21 1010 Summit Ave E

Ms. Nashem explained the Special Tax program and provided photos for board members to review. She said that submitted and eligible rehabilitation costs were \$67, 945 and that work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 1001 Bellevue Place E, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/GH/KJ 6:0:0 Motion carried.

120518.22 Maritime Building  
911 Western Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained eligible work performed was part of second phase of work and the bulk of the work was interior buildout for which no Certificate of Approval was needed. She said there is one tenant for all upper floors. She said that eligible and submitted rehabilitation costs were \$41,568,139. Work for designated portions of the property was performed in conformance with Certificates of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Ms. Barker asked if it included structural work.

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary, said Phase 1 involved demolition and some structural and systems work.

Ms. Sodt said the bulk of work and costs in this phase includes qualified tenant improvements.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

*Mr. Kiel arrived at 3:45 pm and proceeded to Chair the meeting.*

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: the Maritime Building, 911 Western Avenue, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/KJ/GH 6:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel abstained.

**120518.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

120518.31 Harvard-Belmont Landmark District

942 Harvard Avenue E.

Proposed removal of two trees and replanting of one tree

Merrily Chick, property owner and member of Harvard Belmont Application Review Committee, explained the need to remove two dead/dying trees on her property, per arborist recommendation. She said one is a Vine Maple and the other, a Holly. She explained they want to replace the Vine Maple with Native White Style Dogwood. The Holly was a volunteer in the rockery from another nearby tree and they do not want to replace it.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Barker said it made sense.

Mr. Freitas said the arborist recommended against putting in another Vine Maple and the Dogwood replacement is reasonable. He said he had no problem removing the Holly and said it was too big.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for removal of two dead/dying trees and replanting one Dogwood tree at 942 Harvard Ave E as presented.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed landscaping plans as presented December 5, 2018 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the district as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

I. STATEMENT OF INTENT AND PURPOSE

The Development and Design Review Guidelines identify the unique values of the district and are consistent with the purposes of the district and other criteria of SMC 25.22 which created the Landmark District. The guidelines identify design characteristics which have either a positive or negative effect upon the unique values of the district and specify design related considerations which will be allowed, encouraged, limited or excluded from the District when Certificate of Approval applications are reviewed.

Within the District, a Certificate of Approval, issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board, is required prior to the issuance of any city building, demolition, street use, or other permits for proposed work which work is within or visible from a public street, alley or way, and, which involves:

C. The addition or removal of major landscape and site elements, such as retaining walls, gateways, trees or driveways.

In addition, for proposed removal or addition of significant landscape and site elements for which permits are not required, and which are identified specifically in the district Development and Design Review Guidelines, a Certificate of Approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board shall also be required prior to the initiation of the proposed work.

3. GUIDELINES

B. SETTING

1. General

Guideline: New development in the District should not obstruct existing views. The ultimate height of new trees and other landscaping should be considered so that they do not become so dense that views are blocked.

2. The Block

Guideline: Maintain yard space, especially that of front and side yards visible from the street. Front yards should not be used for parking areas. Protect or add trees and landscaping to help reinforce yard edges.

3. Landscaping:

Guideline: Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.

Guideline: Privacy of existing properties should be preserved.

MM/SC/DB/KJ                      8:0:0    Motion carried.

Ms. Chick said she has been on the Harvard Belmont Application Review Committee for a long time and that she goes by the rules. She said that at 803 Prospect they bulldozed, chain sawed the entire yard. They replaced with new Astro turf playfield. She said mature plantings and big trees are gone and asked how they were able to get away with it. She asked if they were fined or cited. She said it is hideous. She said the street trees were not replaced; this is in a historic district. She noted flagrant disobedience. She said they applied after they pulled everything out – by then the yard was wrecked. She said it was done in an inconsiderate and illegal way and that the neighbors are concerned.

Ms. Nashem said they can continue to talk; they applied for the work they did.

Mr. Chalana said it tells the neighbors you can do whatever you please.

Ms. Barker said that topic was not discussed.

Mr. Freitas said that they ripped out everything without asking is terrible; he only saw the replacement plan. He said the conversation revolved around the height of a hedge.

Mr. Chalana asked if the Astro turf is visible from Prospect.

Ms. Doherty said that Ms. Nashem can communicate with the applicant to address what happened.

120518.32

Harvard-Belmont Landmark District

803 East Prospect Street

Proposed installation of a railing on the parapet for a deck

Installation of a railing on the parapet for a deck and brick accents separating the sidewalk from the driveway.

Ms. Nashem explained that the Harvard Belmont Review Committee met November 30, 2018. She said ARC recommended that they simplify the design of the railing. The applicant has submitted an alternative design. ARC would have preferred an alternative attachment detail for the railing attachment but was satisfied that alternatives had been considered but ruled out.

Jay Magruder said they have a Certificate of Approval for the work done; he noted it is true that it was retroactive. He said only portions required were hedge and planting on the north side of the building. He said he understands the rules and said interior landscape is not in purview of the board. He said the planting is 100% complete.

He explained that on the west wide there is a small one-story room with a door leading to a rooftop that was intended to be used. He said there is no railing and they propose to put wrought iron rail on parapet wall. He said he simplified the details, removing finials and second horizontal rail. He said flat square plates attach at the base of post and attach to parapet wall.

Ms. Nashem clarified work and said the rendering provided was old; drawings show the new design.

Mr. Freitas asked the parapet height.

Mr. Magruder said not it is a little over; it goes from 14" – 15" on the south, the northeast corner is 18".

Mr. Freitas said the rail is 2' above that. He asked about the French door.

Mr. Magruder said it has always been there and it has the same moldings. On the north side at the driveway he proposed to put in a strip of brick accent, the same type as used on façade and entry steps. He said the owners want demarcation between public and private space. He said an application has to be made to SDOT.

Board Questions:

Merrily Chick, Harvard-Belmont ARC, asked if bricks are on property line.

Mr. Magruder said the property line is the first entry step to the house; it is close to the house.

Mr. Freitas asked if the proposal puts detail in the right of way and claim that as private space.

Mr. Magruder said the owners just want visual demarcation of private space.

Mr. Kiel said that it is not theirs.

Mr. Magruder said the northwest corner of the yard is right of way; it is unusual. He said when originally built, off the front door was a crescent shape planting area.

Ms. Nashem said SDOT would have to review.

Mr. Hodgins said it seems like a bad idea and could set precedent.

Mr. Magruder noted 1201 Harvard as an example of where it has been done.

Mr. Kiel said being on the other side of the sidewalk is the boundary; it would not be detracting.

Ms. Johnson said the wall at the corner demarcates private property.

Ms. Durham said it was odd.

Mr. Freitas said it is a nice detail but claiming public space as private is problematic.

Ms. Doherty said SDOT will tell determine if it is a problem.

Mr. Hodgins said he would not support projection of private property into public domain. He said the wall already happened.

Ms. Barker said she was glad to see depiction of right of way; she said she agreed with Mr. Hodgins. Historically what was laid out as entrance façade went out to street; parking in the area is a 'creep' that she was less inclined to support. She said it is removable, but it is precedent-setting. She said it will erode the edge.

Mr. Freitas said it is an odd situation; sidewalk, parking, and driveway are confusing.

Ms. Johnson said curb cuts indicate driveway.

Mr. Kiel asked about half moon planting.

Mr. Magruder said it is intended as driveway.

Mr. Kiel asked if the shadow on the drawing refers back to what used to be.

Mr. Hodgins said it is out to the sidewalk and they are pushing boundaries; it is not OK.

Ms. Barker asked about materials behind sidewalk.

Mr. Magruder said it would be a narrow band of sidewalk.

Ms. Barker said he should hold off until he hears from SDOT.

Mr. Freitas said a determination is needed if they are encroaching on public right of way.

Ms. Doherty said that can be stipulated in a condition.

Mr. Freitas said the board is being asked to approve something that has a larger issue of public / private space.

Ms. Doherty said to look at it as if SDOT OK'd it and to determine if it fits character-wise.

Mr. Kiel said just because the board approves, SDOT may not and the board should review if it fits with character of the district – seems reasonable.

Ms. Doherty said every project is looked at individually and the board can have a different opinion for different property; each property is reviewed individually. It should be reviewed whether or not it is appropriate for the district.

Mr. Kiel said the railing is reasonable.

Mr. Guo did not support the brick accents; it seems unnecessarily big. He said the location of the property line should be closer to the sidewalk. He said he was not comfortable with it in the right of way. He said it is not ours to answer about property ownership.

Ms. Sodt said the motion could be contingent on getting other permits, SDOT approval.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for installation of a railing on the parapet for a deck and brick accents separating the sidewalk from the driveway with condition other permits from SDOT are obtained.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed landscaping plans as presented December 5, 2018 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the district as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

I. STATEMENT OF INTENT AND PURPOSE

The Development and Design Review Guidelines identify the unique values of the district and are consistent with the purposes of the district and other criteria of SMC 25.22 which created the Landmark District. The guidelines identify design characteristics which have either a positive or negative effect upon the unique values of the district and specify design related considerations which will be allowed, encouraged, limited or excluded from the District when Certificate of Approval applications are reviewed.

Within the District, a Certificate of Approval, issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board, is required prior to the issuance of any city building, demolition, street use, or other permits for proposed work which work is within or visible from a public street, alley or way, and, which involves:

The demolition of, exterior alterations or additions to any building or structure,

## 2. CRITERIA AND VALUES

### Building Categories

The category of the building shall be considered when changes are proposed.

Category 1 buildings are the most important in the district and these properties shall, to the greatest extent possible, retain the intrinsic historic values recognized when the district was formed.

The buildings within the District are categorized as follows:

Category 1: Buildings and significant landscape elements with an identifiable architectural or historic significance in satisfaction of the appropriate criteria of the Seattle Landmark Ordinance (SMC 25.12) These buildings characterize a distinctive architectural style, or contain elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which are characteristic of an architectural period. The preservation of these elements is of primary importance to the District. May also include historic sites.

### C. INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS

#### 1. Additions or renovations

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

Guideline: Preserve the visual quality of individual facades including use of materials, form and structure.

Guideline: The exterior materials used for additions shall be similar to exterior materials used in the original building and should be finished in ways that are consistent with the original building.

#### Secretary of Interior Standards

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

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

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction 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.

MM/SC/DB/KJ            5:2:0    Mr. Hodgins and Ms. Durham opposed.

Mr. Kiel asked the extent of control.

Ms. Nashem said anything visible from the public right of way. She said they looked during the site visit, the hedge made it not visible.

Mr. Chalana said they took out mature trees.

Mr. Kiel said there was no comment that it was retroactive review.



Ms. Doherty said Ms. Nashem would review it.

120518.33 Wallingford Fire and Police Station  
1629 North 45<sup>th</sup> Street  
Proposed signage

Jeff Schoenberg, NeighborCare Health, said new signage is needed due to rebranding. He said they will just replace like for like – only with new brand; one new sign will be added to the north side of the building. He said they will also change out signage for patient parking.

Ms. Barker said the plan is clear.

Mr. Kiel noted it was one for one replacement and one new.

Mr. Schoenberg said it is a cleaner look.

Ms. Johnson said ARC thought it was reasonable.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Kiel noted it was reasonable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site signage at the Wallingford Fire & Police Station, 1629 North 45<sup>th</sup> Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 111888 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/GH/KJ            7:0:0    Motion carried.

120518.34 Seattle Asian Art Museum  
1400 East Prospect Street  
Proposed changes to interior plaster reconstruction

Ms. Doherty explained the board has already approved a major renovation. Gallery walls are being removed and rebuilt to seismically upgrade the building; they plan was to recreate appearance of plaster walls / detail. They are proposing an alternative material to traditional gypsum plaster, GFRG – glass fiber reinforced gypsum, and therefore she cannot review it as in-kind replacement.

Pamela Trevithick, LMN Architects oriented board members to the three octagonal galleries on the drawings and existing condition plans and went through the planned work.

Mr. Kiel asked about recess for taped joints.

Sean Brith said they will have a gypsum base and then will mud over entire piece and then will skim coat it. He said the finish will be hand-applied. It is an alpha gypsum, similar to what came down; 1/8" – 1/4" thick coat.

Matt Lubbers explained the proposed change in method is due to the quantity of profile and availability of plasterers. He said out of state contractors would have to be used which would be costly.

Ms. Durham asked if it is a complete re-do.

Ms. Trevithick said it will all be new.

Ms. Doherty said there is precedent in terms of the Board approving GFRC- glass fiber reinforced concrete, in exterior applications, but noted this product GFRG hasn't been used yet. She said that a true gypsum veneer was used at Washington Hall following seismic work to skim coat over wall board.

Ms. Barker asked about durability.

Mr. Brith said it is better than existing.

Mr. Hodgins noted the ability to swap out if damaged.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed change to interior plaster reconstruction method at the Seattle Asian Art Museum, 1400 East Prospect Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed method will match the original design, profile, dimensions and texture, but will utilize glass fiber reinforced gypsum (GFRG) rather than gypsum plaster. Recreation of all interior plaster features will be substantiated through the replication of existing profiles, as per Standard #6 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/GH/KJ            7:0:0    Motion carried.

**120518.4            TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS**

120518.41            Leamington Hotel and Apartments/Pacific Hotel  
317 Marion Street

Ms. Sodt explained that the Board is requested to verify the eligibility of the Leamington Hotel and Apartments/Pacific Hotel at 317 Marion Street for the transfer of development rights (TDR); the Board is also requested to approve the required covenant. She said Controls and Incentives agreement is in place, SDCI established the amount of TDR, and the building been rehabilitated and maintained over the years. Transfer would be in the downtown area. She said she worked with owner to develop the agreement. The code provisions require:

- Designation of the building(s) as a City of Seattle Landmark, pursuant to SMC 25.12;
- Execution of a Controls and Incentive Agreement regarding the Landmark and recording of same against the property;
- Receipt of a TDR authorization letter from SDCI, which establishes the amount of TDRs available for transfer from the sending site;
- Provisions of security to assure completion of any required rehabilitation and restoration of the landmark, unless such work has been completed.
- The owner must also execute and record an agreement in the form and content acceptable to the Landmarks Preservation Board providing for the maintenance of the historically significant features of the building, per SMC 23.49.014D(4). The owner has completed, and the City Historic Preservation Officer has approved, subject to final approval by the Board, a covenant that includes the commitment of the owner to maintain the Leamington Hotel and Apartments consistent with Ordinance No. 117398.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board makes the determination that the Leamington Hotel and Apartments at 317 Marion Street has fulfilled the requirements for transfer of Landmark TDR pursuant to SMC 23.49.014 and Ordinance No. 120443 – that the building is a designated Landmark with a Controls and Incentives Agreement pursuant to Ordinance No. **117398**; that an authorization letter from SDCI has been received and has identified the number of transferable square feet to be 79,920 square feet; and, the building is not presently in need of rehabilitation, therefore no security is required.

MM/SC/KJ/GH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approved the agreement entitled “COVENANTS FOR LANDMARK TRANSFERABLE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS” as submitted to the Board as the legal agreement required as a condition to the transfer of development rights from the Leamington Hotel and Apartments at 317 Marion Street, per SMC 23.49.014D (4).

MM/SC/KJ/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

## **120518.5 NOMINATIONS**

120518.51

University of Washington Pavilion Pool  
2602 NE Snohomish Lane South

Mr. Kiel said his firm has done work for University of Washington Bothell campus, and that he would recuse himself if anyone objected to his participation. There was no objection from the Board or from the property owner.

Mike McCormick, University of Washington, appreciated working with the board and said there has been productive conversation and some fun nominations, e.g. Canoe House. He said there are more coming as they plan seismic upgrades and renovations. He said they are not in the same category as the Shell House. He said they have no use for the pool anymore and the dormitory doesn't meet student expectations. He said input will help them shape their plans and do fundraising.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She said the building was built in 1938 at one end of the Men's Physical Education Building / Hec Edmundson Pavilion (Hec Ed). Hec Ed was constructed in 1927-28 and a swimming pool was planned but was deleted due to cost overruns. When it was finally constructed it was designed in a different style, simplified in a modern way. She said the entry was larger than it was earlier planned. The pool is 75' long and has six lanes; competitive swim teams met there until the 1960s. She provided an overview of the southeast portion of the campus. She said Hec Ed is an Italian Renaissance Revival building. She said two storage additions are on the back. On the south façade she noted door detail banding elements around pilasters, louvered opening, reinforced concrete with brick veneer, and cast stone. The southwest corner abuts original Hec Ed building. The east elevation is plain, no windows, two door openings, two bands of brick set in contrast to fascia. The Graves additions to Hec Ed are postmodern and contrast to the original building. The north façade of the pool building is obscured. She said the interior is intact – with spectator seating, balcony cross over entry, and women's locker room which took a portion of the men's locker room. She noted the piping in the lower basement.

She provided a history of campus development and noted the southeast area was the sports activity area. The original UW stadium was built in the 1920's. She said a 1949 addition was never added. She provided perspective views of the building and said the pool building has a gabled roofline but is simpler than originally planned. The pool building is listed as a separate building but is really part of Hec Ed.

Ms. Boyle said Bebb and Gould designed the building. She said the fenestration is different from the original plan and the gabled roof is similar to what was originally planned. She said that people used to swim in lakes and noted there was a rise in public pools in the 1920s and 1930's; swimming became a popular sport. She noted the aqua theater for watching swimming. She noted the specificity of design – concrete frame, brick veneer, cast stone and steel roof truss. She said there were many changes to Hec Ed over time.

She said that Carl Gould and Charles Bebb designed campus plans and many buildings on and off campus. She said that the Collegiate Gothic style allowed use by a lot of different programs. She noted the Henry Art Gallery, a 1930's building that showed a transition from the Collegiate Gothic toward Modernism. Melvin Oliver Sylliaasen (1890-1956) was a Seattle structural engineer who practiced in the teens

through the 1940s and served as City Engineer during the 1930s. She said he had a varied career.

She said that the building is intact, but an abutting addition reduced its legibility. She said the building doesn't meet any of the standards for designation: there are no significant associations; it is linked to collegiate activity but doesn't meet the double significance of C; it is a transition style; there are better examples of Gould's work; it is not an outstanding style or method of construction; it is overshadowed by other buildings.

Mr. Freitas asked if the Pool Pavilion really is a separate building from Hec Ed.

Ms. Boyle said on the UW survey it is listed as a separate building.

Mr. Freitas questioned if it can be separated out and distinguished from Hec Ed. He said it is an addition and it is odd that we are considering an addition.

Ms. Boyle said Hec Ed has had too many changes to be considered.

Ms. Barker asked if that has been discussed with staff.

Ms. Boyle said it was surveyed.

Ms. Doherty said she didn't know if Mmes. Sordt and Blakely talked about it, but it appears to be conceived as its own building; it abuts another has its own locker room. She believes it can be viewed as a standalone building with a party wall.

Mr. Hodgins said it is hard to get a view of the north side where there are nice windows.

Ms. Barker said the hand rail looks like a cloud.

Ms. Boyle said there is one on each side; it is an Art Deco element.

Public Comment:

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, spoke in support of nomination and said it is an important Depression-era design. He said it is significant for its association with Bebb and Gould, PWA, swim pool culture in the northwest. He said he wanted to learn more about structures built to contain swimming pools. He said the south elevation is the primary elevation as built. He said the north seems secondary. He said this is part of a district of athletic use buildings.

Ms. Barker asked if the interior is original.

Ms. Boyle said the cloud railing and bleachers are original, light fixtures and ceiling. She said the glazed office was removed and the entries to locker rooms have been modified. The pool is original.

Mr. Hodgins said it is an interesting building. The north façade was not intended to be primary. He said the windows are interesting. He said the south façade is intact.

He said the addition to the north doesn't take away from the original design. He supported nomination and said the inside is a time capsule. He wanted to learn more about the PWA.

Ms. Johnson said she was on the fence, leaning toward not supporting nomination. She said it is a nice building and noted the variation of brick color. She said the south façade is nice. She said in context with the campus it is not a landmark. She said the history of swimming is interesting, but the building doesn't embody that. She said the PWA is interesting.

Mr. Freitas did not support nomination and said it is a confusing building. He said it seems like part of Hec Ed. He said it doesn't meet any criteria. He said nothing stands out.

Ms. Durham said she was on the fence but that it was worthy noting it is a transitional style. She said Hec Ed and this building present that picture. The building is not significant enough to meet Criterion C. She said she was a tentative 'yes'.

Ms. Barker noted the WPA program within an educational institution and said she was privileged to be there. She noted Title 9 results, and everything got put into one location – men and women. She said that was significant. She said the interior is a time capsule. She said it feels like its own building and she wants to understand how much that reads. She supported nomination.

Mr. Guo did not support nomination. He said in context of UW as a student he never knew it was there, although it is an interesting building.

Mr. Kiel said he was on the fence but leaned toward not supporting. He said it is an addition to Hec Ed. It is inconsequential as a building on campus and as an example of Bebb and Gould's work. He said it has been maintained well, but it is not important.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of University of Washington Pavilion Pool at 2602 NE Snohomish Lane South for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the exterior of the building; the interior of the building and a portion of the site around the south and east sides of the building measured twenty feet horizontally from the base of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for January 16, 2019; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/DB/GH            3:4:0    Motion failed. Ms. Johnson and Messrs. Freitas, Guo, and Kiel opposed.

120518.52            University of Washington Haggett Hall  
4920 Whitman Court NE

Spencer Howard and Katie Pratt, Northwest Vernacular, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file).

Mr. Howard reported that the building was constructed in 1963 in the northeast campus; it was designed by Kirk, Wallace, McKinley and Associates. He said it is an H-shape building on a square base with plaza and common area breezeway. He said landscape was designed for slope stabilization. He said the building is of reinforced concrete column structure, towers with canted bays, stacked dorms, precast panels, alternating louvers and windows for ventilation, aluminum wall system, concrete slab roof and corrugated profile.

The interior layout generally consists of three main functional areas: support functions in the base level; plaza level common area for building residents; and student housing and associated function spaces in the towers. There are nine floors within each tower, including the plaza level of each tower. The common area matches the footprint of the first floor/plaza level lobby. Elevators provide the principal means of circulation and are located on either end of the lobby.

Mr. Howard said two-story, atrium type common areas connect floors 1 and 2, 3 and 4, and 5 and 6. Each common area features a central two-story volume with a perimeter walkway at the upper level. An open stairway at the east end connects the two levels. Lounge areas at the lower level, along the inner side of each tower, extend out to the perimeter curtain wall and are two-story open volumes. The outer sides of each tower off the central common area contain dorm rooms.

At each of the upper tower floors, a pair of narrow, concrete-wall hallways extend from the east and west ends of the common area. These service the irregularly shaped dorm rooms along the perimeter and shared bathroom and shower, and small study areas along the center of the floor. There are 26 residential dormitory rooms per floor, 12 to either side of the common area. Typical of dorm room design, the beds and desks are along the outer walls leaving the central area open for circulation. Each 148-square foot room has one window and a louvered opening on the opposite wall. The window and vent placement allow for cross ventilation. A small triangular closet provides additional shared storage space for each room.

Ms. Pratt went over historic context of the campus planning post WWII. She noted a stylistic shift away from Collegiate Gothic and an experiment with styles. She said design had been for male students and by 1951 there was housing for women. In 1934 Bebb and Gould brought the steep slope back into use for dorm space; in 1949 dorms were moved back to the north. She explained the growing need for dorm housing in the 1960's due to the GI Bill, and an influx of students. She said McCarty Hall was the first of the 1960's dorms. In 1962 Haggett Hall departed from the 1960 plan and created a hard edge to the campus with no attempt to bring it in. She said the first student housing dorms were in 1896, one for men and one for women (Lewis and Clarks Halls). By 1900's dorms were on campus supplemented by sorority and fraternity houses. She said prefab dorms were provided for married couples and McCarty Hall, in 1960-62, was built for women; it was a new form, central block, linked by dorm wing. She said then Haggett and McMahan halls were built; Haggett Hall was advertised as the first coed housing but in McMahan they occupied the same wing.

Mr. Howard said the building has a double loaded corridor and has clustered bathrooms and layout. He said that McCarty Hall has double loaded corridor, shared common bathrooms, and dorms on outer wall. She said that Haggett Hall has

continued this same layout. She said that McMahan was the only dorm with a clustered layout with clusters sharing a bathroom. He said by the 1960's constrained campus and high enrollment led to high rise dorms; this was a statewide trend.

Mr. Howard explained the building was designed by the firm of Kirk, McKinley, and Wallace which was formed in 1960. In 1964, the Seattle Chapter of the American Institute of Architects awarded honors to four buildings and Haggett Hall was one of the recipients. They designed many buildings including PlayHouse, Balmer Hall, Odegaard Library, Faculty Club, Haggett Hall, McMahan Hall, Meany Hall, and Red Square, among others. He said engineering firm was Worthington, Skilling, Helle, and Jackson, now it is Magnusson Klemencic. They were involved in numerous important local buildings such as the Kingdome and Seafirst tower.

Mr. Kiel asked about the use of precast concrete.

Mr. Howard said McMahan Hall used precast concrete. He said there is no explanation for why exposed aggregate and the base relief panels were chosen.

Ms. Barker appreciated hearing about other dorm buildings. She said she was struck by the angularity of this one and asked if there are any others like it.

Ms. Pratt said the corrugated exterior / folded plate is used at Exhibition Hall Commons. She said it is such a stark comparison from McMahan Hall.

Mr. Kiel asked if they were doing similar façade crenellation and said it is very '1960s'.

Ms. Barker said she hadn't seen it in other institutional buildings.

Ms. Johnson said noted the view it provides.

Ms. Pratt said it does.

Ms. Barker asked how a building was designed and built without following the campus master plan.

Mr. Howard said he didn't find anything explicit but there was pressure based on enrollment.

Ms. Barker asked if they had to retroactively deal with the masterplan.

Mr. Spencer said they think that may be true.

Public Comment:

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, said he appreciated the analysis, mapping, floorplans and asked the board to support nomination. He said concrete design is underappreciated and this is highly expressive post-WW II architecture. He said the building shows a rational design, new and aspirational, and an early example of co-ed dorms. He said the building responded to the unique needs of the users and attempted to foster cluster relationships. He noted James Fitzgerald for the art relief work and said that Haggett Hall was an



award-winning work. He hoped that at consideration of designation, the work of the structural engineers could be presented.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Barker supported nomination and said it is an intriguing building that people know. She noted the Brutalistic features, prominent design and construction firms. She said it would meet criteria D and F.

Mr. Hodgins did not support nomination and said he didn't appreciate this architecture with extreme ideas, pushing the envelope. Although, he noted the fireplace is awesome.

Ms. Johnson said it is of its era, that it is modern from the 1960's. She appreciated the different patterns of housing. She said the building is more interesting in drawings, the plan is rigid. She said the building was made for a sloping site, the towers could be anywhere. She said it is a distinct style but there are better examples.

Mr. Kiel said the building seems transitional to Brutalism.

Ms. Johnson said the towers float; this isn't quite there.

Ms. Durham said the building was attempting to do a few things but not successfully. She said it feels difficult to fit into a category; it doesn't embody a particular style.

Mr. Guo said he was on the fence but leaned toward no. He said if you stand below it pops out. As a dorm, it doesn't cater to the needs of students.

Mr. Freitas said he was conflicted and that it doesn't embody a style, but a period. He said he was having difficulty articulating it but that he did not support nomination.

Mr. Kiel said being able to place it in an era is not an embodiment. He said McMahon Hall was a good example and a good counterpoint to this one.

Action: I move that the Board deny the nomination of University of Washington Haggett Hall at 4290 Whitman Court NE for consideration as a Seattle Landmark.

MM/SC/GH/KJ            6:1:0    Motion carried. Ms. Barker opposed.

**120518.6        STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator