



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 180/17

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, March 15, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Russell Coney
Kathleen Durham
Garrett Hodgins
Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Matthew Sneddon
Steven Treffers
Emily Vyhnanek

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Julianne Patterson

Chair Aaron Luoma called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

031517.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 1, 2017

MM/SC/RK/EV

5:0:3 Minutes approved. Ms. Barker, Messrs. Coney and Hodgins abstained.

February 15, 2017

MM/SC/RK/EV 5:0:3 Minutes approved. Messrs. Kiel, Coney and Hodgins abstained.

031517.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

031517.21 Schoenfeld Building
1012 First Avenue
Proposed storefront modification

Ms. Sodt explained the storefronts are almost all new and the tenant wants to switch the door from one side to the other. She said there are original pilasters but will not be impacted. She said she is working on signage administratively.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kiel said it is all non-original material and ARC reviewed the work.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations to the Schoenfeld Building, 1012 First Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 124934, 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/ST/RK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

031517.22 Medical Dental Building
509 Olive Way
Proposed business signage

Ms. Sodt said the proposal is straightforward; they propose a sign beneath entry canopy and will switch out sign face. She said there is a signage plan on the building but no administrative review.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kiel said it is straightforward.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage alterations to the Medical Dental Building, 509 Olive Way, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 122316, 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/KJ/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

031517.3 TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

031517.31 The Arctic Building
306 Cherry Street

Ms. Sodt explained Transfer of Development Rights is an incentive for designated properties. Requirements include:
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 Arctic Building consistent with Ordinance No. 116969.

She said that Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections will calculate FAR and square footage to determine the number of TDR.

Ms. Durham arrived at 3:40 pm.

Ms. Johnson asked how TDR are marketed.

Responding to questions Ms. Sodt said there is no City staff to facilitate sale; Karen Gordon use to do it. She said it is a private transaction. She said where TDR can be used is complicated and she noted there are sub-regions in downtown. She said you need a market that supports it.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board makes the determination that the Arctic Building at 700 Third Avenue 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. **116969**; that an authorization letter from SDCI has been received and has identified the number of transferable square feet to be 77,184.56 square feet; and, the building is not presently in need of rehabilitation, therefore no security is required.

MM/SC/RK/DB 9:0:0 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 Arctic Building at 700 Third Avenue, per SMC 23.49.014D (4).

MM/SC/RK/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

The following items were reviewed out of agenda order.

031517.6 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES

031517.61 Seattle Times Building - 1947 Office Building Addition
1120 John Street

Jessica Clawson explained the four-month extension.

Ms. Barker said it was gratifying to see that the applicant took ARC preferences for layout that kept buildings off the landmarked Office Building.

Ms. Sodt said that towers were moved to northeast and southwest corners.

Ms. Clawson said the rectangular option provides better views and relation with landmark.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – 1947 Office Building Addition, 1120 John Street, for four months.

MM/SC/RK/DB 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

031517.62 Seattle Times Building - Printing Plant
1120 John Street

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Building – Printing Plant, 1120 John Street, for four months.

MM/SC/RK/KJ 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

031517.4 DESIGNATION

031517.41

Eldridge Tire Co. Building
1519 Broadway

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). She said her presentation would focus on responding to questions put forth by the board at the nomination meeting. She provided context of the building and neighborhood. She said the building comprises two small retail spaces, a porte cochère and open lot. She said that the original roof was clay tiles but most has been covered by asphalt since the 1990's; some clay tiles remain. She said the bulkhead tile remains but has been painted.

She said the building does not meet Criterion A. She said that the building is associated with Arthur Eldridge but Eldridge Buick in Spokane is on the National Register is more significant; she said it doesn't meet Criterion B. She said that the building may meet Criterion C for its association with auto row on Capitol Hill. She said that Eldridge had a bigger showroom on the corner. She said there were many small service stations on Capitol Hill but they are gone. She said there would have been a gas pump at this site. She said that it may meet Criterion D as an example of Mission Revival style. She noted the style is indigenous California architecture and said there are similar auto related buildings there and proceeded to provide photos. She provided other examples of the style in Seattle: L'Amourita Apartments, Cornish – Booth Building, Pontius Garage, Queen Anne bungalow court, among others. She noted the building maintains its parapet, arch, stucco, and some roof tile.

Ms. Mirro said that the building may or may not meet Criterion E. Albertson designed U. W. Metropolitan Tract, Cornish School, Northern Life Building, YMCA Downtown, among others. She said that building would not meet Criterion F because it isn't real visible.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if there were any tanks on site. He said it would have been small – one pump.

Mr. Treffers asked if there had been buildings in the back.

Ms. Mirro said before this building went up there was a shed.

Mr. Hodgins asked if Eldridge had others buildings in Seattle.

Ms. Mirro said he had a lot – Ballard, Roosevelt.

Mr. Coney said he was a significant person; he was the Buick dealer in the entire region. He had a monopoly until the 1930's. He said that Eldridge had this building commission and built to support his auto buildings.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation based on criteria C and D. He said there are interesting auto related fancy buildings but this is modest, smaller and has

architectural style. He said it still expresses architectural character. He said it is a unique structure – a gem of its own. He said the architect applied his own skill set to this. He said he enjoys the building and said it is connected to the economic history of the City. He said it was headquarters to a regional corporation and it is connected to the community history of auto row in Pike Pine over to Madison. He said it tells an interesting part of the story.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported designation based on criteria C and D. She said it is still the same size, mass, scale and maintains its shape. She said it is connected to the history of Eldridge’s monopoly. She said this building helped maintain his businesses. She said the architectural style is unique and that she enjoys the tiny building.

Ms. Barker supported designation. She said she was concerned about the volume to the west and said she sees something that helps tell the story without being one of the unfortunate facades. She said criteria C and D and maybe B apply. She said she was curious about the back parking lot and what is meant by ‘exterior’.

Mr. Kiel said the site is not nominated so someone could build right up to the wall.

Ms. Johnson did not support designation. She said being auto-related is important as well is the Mission style as it relates to auto related building. She said the parking lot is as important as the building and not including it tips her to not supporting designation.

Mr. Treffers supported designation on criteria C and D. He thanked Ms. Mirro for providing more examples about how the style is related to similar auto-related properties. He said it is more of a property type. He said it is a small building which shows the entry to the lot. He said the lot was a function of the property and a character defining element. He said it relates to how we interpret the building. He said regarding Criterion C Eldridge’s business was significant within the economic heritage of the City and region.

Ms. Durham wasn’t sure but said the lot is relevant. She said it could end up atrocious and there would be no control. She said the building is a unique example of the type. She said she would support designation on Criterion D.

Mr. Hodgins did not support designation for what he called a fancy parking lot.

Mr. Coney supported designation based on criteria B, C, and D. He said that Eldridge built the building and he was significant throughout the region. He said it has unique character and it relates to the building across the street.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation because it wouldn’t be able to tell its story.

Mr. Treffers said the board is looking at what is there now and if it is currently able to convey its significance, not any future project.

Mr. Kiel said it would be designating a parking lot.

Ms. Barker said the lot would have had stacks of tires.

Mr. Ketcherside said it was storage for the dealerships.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Eldridge Tire Company Building at 1519 Broadway as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C and D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/RK/EV 6:3:0 Motion carried. Messrs. Kiel, Hodgins and Ms. Johnson opposed.

031517.5 NOMINATION

031517.51 Frederick Boyd Company/American Meter & Appliance Building
1001-1005 Westlake Avenue North

Erich Guenther, owner, said the building doesn't meet any criteria; it is an old building and in bad condition.

Larry Johnson, The Johnson Partnership, provided context of the neighborhood and site. He said the original wood sash windows were replaced last year and the storefront is from 1970. He said the upper floors had vinyl windows installed over a year ago. He said the wood sash windows were a character defining element. He said that the structural form and massing have been maintained, the north bulkheads have been removed and the original glazing has been replaced with non-compatible vinyl.

He said the building does not meet criteria A, B, or C. He noted the association with development of South Lake Union and Westlake and the development of the streetcar. He said that the area behind the trestle was filled in. He said the site was residential early on and then a gas station. He said the Hill Syrup Company occupied space in the building from 1919-1923. He said that land use patterns changed with transportation improvements. He said that the building was constructed as a warehouse and manufacturing and he compared it to the Bemis Building and the Louise Wiles Biscuit building. He said that its character-defining multi-sash windows are gone so it doesn't meet Criterion D. he said that it doesn't meet Criterion E because it is an Early Mason design and build building. He said that Henry Bittman was the engineer on the project, not the architect. He showed permit documents where Bittman has signed off as engineer and he said that the drawing does not have Bittman's title block, which he always used. He said that Bittman applied for permits but that he didn't know the level of input. He said that Hurley and Mason were both trained civil engineers who built the Olympia Cereal Mills building, Board of Trade building, Fort Lewis, Veterans Hospital. He said that Bittman was a prolific architect who created his credentials. He said that he had two drafting and engineering classes in Chicago only. He said that he could attract good designers who were loyal. He said that buildings attributed to him include the Decatur, Mann, Fraternal Order of Eagles, and Olympic Tower. He said this is not an outstanding work of either. He said that any building on this site would be prominent so it would not meet Criterion F.

Mr. Guenther said the windows were in poor condition and a safety hazard; panes were falling out. He said the space had not been occupied for several years after the previous owner died. He said that no significant maintenance had been done and that there was plexi screwed in. He said the intent to lease out the space is important. He said the tenants were unhappy and difficult to keep warm. He said that they had no tenancy on the second floor. They changed the windows.

Mr. Ketcherside asked who did the work.

Mr. Guenther said just a contractor they use for maintenance for their buildings.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if they had a permit to replace the windows.

Mr. Guenther said that it is their understanding permits are not required for non-structural repairs to buildings. He said they have never obtained a permit for repair of non-structural item such as a window.

Ms. Barker asked about the south façade.

Mr. Johnson said it is just a blank wall.

Ms. Barker asked about property line and Mr. Johnson indicated where it is against the building. She said what happened at the north end of the triangle where the curb ramps area. She asked if that was ever part of this property. She asked if the triangle was part of this lot or another lot.

Mr. Johnson said it has already been public right of way and indicated area on the plan. He said he wasn't sure.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if Mr. Johnson found the transaction when Boyd bought the property and who he bought it from.

Mr. Johnson said no.

Mr. Ketcherside said he suspected he bought it from Theodore Haller. He said it was a Mercer plat initially. He said he was looking through some city ordinances and clerk files and saw building below – the window/sash place – used to be the Ward Street right of way. He got a big street vacation for that two months after the permit was filed for this building. As this was under construction he had ownership of that property and developed the other building. Before this building he believes Haller gifted the end of the triangle to the City – in 1911 – and deeded it to the city to be part of intersection and he coincidentally received the Ward Street right of way as vacation.

Ms. Barker asked about if there were parking stalls in the building.

Mr. Johnson said no. He indicated on plan parking lot location.

Mr. Guenther said the City transformer just north of the property line.

Ms. Barker asked the status of the parapet.

Mr. Guenther said it is intact, not modified.

Mr. Treffers said it was stated in the nomination report that the south façade was replaced with concrete masonry units.

Mr. Johnson didn't recall that but said it was not replaced, it was infilled; it was the original right of way and they could have put glazing on that.

Mr. Ketcherside said it would have been surrounded on four sides by City right of way.

Ms. Barker said the plan mentions a vacated right of way.

Mr. Ketcherside said you would see that Ward Street continued right through. He said he was confused by the land use and the streets around this property in the decade prior.

Mr. Johnson indicated the site on photo and pointed out where the sash company was and the building line was.

Mr. Treffers said the plan said it is hollow tile and asked if how or when that was altered.

Mr. Johnson said the original drawings don't show glazing.

Ms. Doherty said she thought it was originally hollow clay tile and concrete frame.

Mr. Treffers said the nomination said the wall was changed to CMU; he asked if that is correct, and on what was the basis for that.

Mr. Johnson said it is probably not correct. He said he picked up a couple errors and noted they continue to do research after the nomination.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if it was always a blank wall of hollow clay tiles.

Mr. Johnson said yes.

Collin Madden, owner, said it appears those would have been window bays but they are much later cinderblocks.

Mr. Ketcherside said a small error in the report has the building being occupied in September 1919 and the plans were filed in August. He said the earliest ads he could find were March 1920.

Mr. Johnson said it showed up in Polk's Directory at that time and started advertising. They may not have had the building but they may have started selling product. He said a minor error in uses listed in the report is that at this time it was occupied by a transfer company

Mr. Coney asked where the original windows are.

Mr. Guenther said they were disposed of in the summer of 2016; they bought the building in March 2016.

Ms. Barker asked if they have photos from their comparables or their list of sale.

Mr. Madden said he was sure there are pictures.

Ms. Barker asked that they be passed along to Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson said he has a picture taken about that period of time.

Ms. Durham asked if the building was empty when they bought it.

Mr. Guenther said just the top floor. He said the former apartment of the former owner. He said the former owner's company was still operating below. The top floor is occupied now.

Mr. Coney asked how the windows operate.

Mr. Johnson said they were huge casement; every third window opened as a casement window. He said they opened inward.

Ms. Mirro said only on two of the facades.

Mr. Johnson was unable to find photo of building at time of sale and said if it goes to designation he would provide it then.

Mr. Ketcherside noted when going through the old photos Mr. Johnson said he believed the property was under water in many of the early photos. He said Mercer is Eden's Addition Number 2 Plat that he filed in 1871 – this block is in the middle of that plat. He said the plat is strangely shaped like it was a little point of land which is where the Kenmore Air is now. He said because of the weird shape of the plat it looked like he was doing the shoreline of the lake.

Mr. Johnson said it was really right on the shoreline it is hard to tell because they didn't have GIS maps the.

Mr. Ketcherside said he was interested in the overall story of development of the shoreline of Lake Union after the ship canal was cut through and the lake level dropped.

Mr. Johnson said Lake Washington dropped eleven feet. He explained the shore varied because there was a dam at the northern end of the lake; every once in a while the dam would break loose and all the house boats that were there would sit on the lake bottom. He said the dam flowed into Salmon Bay. He said the town of Ross disappeared.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if there was a change in character and overall development to this area after the ship canal was cut.

Mr. Johnson said an engineering report had been done.

Mr. Guenther said there was an engineering report and the engineer had quite a few comments. He said there are limited opportunities for adapting the existing building and that was the overriding info from the engineer that there would be significant stabilization issues partially because of the shape.

Mr. Coney asked if they did due diligence before purchasing the building.

Mr. Guenther said that there was a lot of due diligence done by other parties.

Mr. Ketcherside said that the building must be part of the story of redevelopment of lakeshore after the ship canal was open. He wondered if Mr. Johnson had more of that story.

Mr. Johnson showed photos of the windows and noted the deterioration of the muntins. He said the muntins are thin for a wood window that size.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about the redevelopment of the shoreline.

Mr. Johnson referred to the Bogue Report. He said Lake Union was going to be the ocean going ship development area, warehouses etc. He said the ship canal opened in 1917. He said that Mr. Ketcherside was implying that this would have been the type of building they were trying to attract. He said there were a lot of nasty buildings; there was a bleach manufacturing and he is sure there was a lot of chlorine dumped into the lake; a lot of industries on the waterside including Seattle Oil Depot was here and major contamination mitigation had to be done when it was demolished. He said there were paint and building suppliers were manufactured here; the area was serviced by the railroad and the piers.

Mr. Treffers asked why the previous surveys were not mentioned in the nomination.

Ms. Sodt noted that survey was done by Kate Krafft and Jennifer Meissner.

Mr. Johnson said that the building was eligible but that was before the windows were taken out and it was also mentioned in the South Lake Union survey that was done as part of the Mercer redevelopment and tunnel EIS.

Mr. Treffers asked why that wasn't in the nomination; other nominations contain references to past survey work.

Mr. Johnson said it was his own preference. He cited the Nyberg Steinbrueck surveys and said that things have changed so much that he doesn't pay attention to those anymore. He said you have to resurvey it yourself. He said those surveys were all conducted prior to the window removal and if it was surveyed now the surveyor may have a different opinion. He said that windows are a big point. He said the building would no longer be eligible for the National Register because of the loss of windows. He said the DAHP no longer considers this building eligible for the National Register.

Ms. Sodt clarified there was a comprehensive survey done in South Lake Union as a result of the upzone. It was comprehensively surveyed – Cascade, Lake Union, South Lake Union 2014.

Mr. Treffers said he has seen that survey that DAHP identified this building as eligible and two surveys identified this property as eligible. H

Mr. Johnson said if he had surveyed it in 2014 he would have said it is eligible.

Mr. Treffers said it is pertinent information and part of the record of this property. He appreciates that survey methods have changed it is still worthwhile to have this information.

Mr. Johnson said he usually includes that in the first pages of the nomination. He said he didn't know about the survey that Ms. Sodt mentioned.

Mr. Treffers said that regarding typology and context provided in the nomination there is no citation to discussion of this property type. He said he reads the footnotes and he was looking for what was used in coming up with the context because it is a highly critical discussion of how this typology fits into early 20th century industrial properties.

Mr. Johnson said he is competent in typologies and he wrote it.

Mr. Treffers said he wants to see more footnotes and likes to look at this in a larger picture not just looking at a vacuum. He wants to understand where the context is coming from.

Mr. Johnson said if necessary they can provide that information.

Mr. Treffers said we have seen great discussions of the late 19th Century and there is a discussion of the 1930s but there is a gap about where this property fits in which is immediately post WWI – 1920s and that jump from brick masonry and timber to concrete construction. He said it is a notable shift.

Mr. Johnson said he mentioned Sunshine Baking Company which was from the 1920s. He said it more typology is wanted they can provide it.

Mr. Treffers said it is needed when looking at Criterion D. He said he believes that would provide a bit more comparative context for how this building fits in with that property type.

Mr. Johnson said there is not a lack of examples although we are losing them. He said in the industrial areas of the City there were a lot of reinforced concrete buildings in the 1920's and most are reinforced concrete. It was an economical way to build a building.

Public Comment:

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, read a letter he submitted (in DON file). He noted the scarcity of comparable examples and noted the warehouse fabric typology her has been lost. He said that the windows don't mar or distract from the mass and siting.

David Rash said that this is an early excellent example of Bittman's work. He said that five of the six drawings have his name on them and he played a significant role in the design. He said the paper announced it as early Mason's contract method – a design-build where they hired outside designers. He said design-build is rare example of post WWI South Lake Union building type.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, sent a letter of support (in DON file). She said she agreed with Mr. Herschensohn. She compared this building to other landmarks – the Maritime and 619 Western – and said it is similar. She said that adaptive reuse has been done many times and windows are fixable. She said that removal of the windows would require a permit from SDCI. She supported nomination of the building and noted its association with the development of South Lake Union. She said it is inappropriate to replace. She said the building can convey its significance and it embodies the type of construction.

Marvin Anderson said he is working on restoration of the Henry Bittman house and archives. He went over Bittman's history and noted the Kingsley partnership and that identifying himself as structural engineer designed 13 theaters in Seattle. He said the reinforced concrete style was used after WWI. He said after registering as an architect Adams worked for him and he started doing the buildings he is known for. He said around 1918 he transitioned from engineer to architect and this is where he was bring an architect. He said it is one of the only buildings he designed. He said the building is advanced for concrete construction. He said the building is significant in his career and as an architect.

Brooke Best, Historic Seattle, said it is a great example of Bittman's strengths were engineering ability and architectural sensibility. She said the building needs further context. She said it is one of the few that survives in this area and there is more and more loss in this area. She said that it meets Criterion F in prominence of siting. She said it stands as important and is visible and identifiable. She said the window removal is troubling. It still conveys its integrity in form, massing, and setting.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker supported nomination. She said the north bulkhead was removed in 1974, 43 years ago. She said the small manufacturing building conveys its significance and its industrial heritage. She said the windows are removed but the bones are there. She said there is integrity there and it is purer in form.

Ms. Vyhnanek was undecided.

Mr. Hodgins supported nomination. Regarding Criterion D he said the window are not the only defining characteristic and the interior is interesting. He said noted the interesting discussion about Bittman and he said this is an early work of his.

Ms. Durham supported nomination and said the context is the scarcity of buildings in South Lake Union. She said this building reminds her of the Maritime Building. She said the building is connected to South Lake Union, the lake, railroad, streetcar. She said like the Maritime windows they can be replaced.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and said he wants more information about the context of the building when built and South Lake Union development. He asked about the post government locks development. He wanted more information about the site's context from 1910-20. He wanted more information about how the site has changed, the vacations of the streets and a broader view of changes to roads etc. He cited the Bogue Report and asked about impact to this property, who was the owner, and what was happening to the site at the time. He said it is unfortunate the windows are gone but the structure carries significance as a warehouse building.

Mr. Coney supported nomination and said it conveys its significance. He said he lives in a 1918 building and the windows last 100 years if properly maintained. He said this is an early example of Bittman's work and said he would like more information. He said this building provides roots to the past. He noted the connection to Lake Union, Steam Plant, MOHAI and said there are not many from this context.

Mr. Treffers supported nomination and said method of construction is relevant. He said a newspaper article at the time called this one of the finest examples of 'modern factory building' in Seattle. He said it embodies its function and use and it is on a prominent location. He said the connection to Bittman is notable. He said this is a great example of a factory building developed by intelligent design. He said that knowing the history of Lake Union in post WWI era, this played a significant part of the economic heritage. He supported inclusion of interiors and noted the exposed timber evident in some of the photos.

Ms. Vyhnaneck supported nomination and noted the bones are there. She wants to know more about Bittman's engineer to architect transition. She wanted to know how things changed around the building.

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination. He said it is sad the windows are gone but that is irrelevant. He said Bittman question is interesting and he would like to hear more but without the windows he wouldn't support nomination. He said the windows were character defining.

MM/SC/DB/RK 8:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel opposed.

031517.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator