



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 386/17

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday, June 7, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Russell Coney

Kathleen Durham

Garrett Hodgins

Robert Ketcherside

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

Julianne Patterson

Matthew Sneddon

Steven Treffers

Emily Vyhnanek

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

060717.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 5, 2017

MM/SC/DB/RK 10:0:0 Minutes approved.

April 19, 2017

MM/SC/DB/KJ 9:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Ketcherside abstained.

060717.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

060717.21 Pier 54
1001 Alaskan Way

Ms. Sodt explained the Special Tax Valuation program. The submitted and eligible costs were \$ 22,705,402.51.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Pier 54, 1001 Alaskan Way, 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/ST/RK 10:0:0 Motion carried.

060717.22 Ballard Avenue Landmark District
5101 Ballard Avenue NW

Ms. Sodt reported that the submitted and eligible costs were \$337,358; there were no disallowed costs. The work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board.

Ms. Patterson arrived at 3:35 pm.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Certification: the Hansen Building, 5101 Ballard Ave NW. This action is based upon the criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; 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/RK/DB 11:0:0 Motion carried.

060717.3

CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

060717.31

Fort Lawton Landmark District

4204 and 4206 Washington Avenue West

Repairs and reconstructing portions of the building in-kind, following a fire.

Ms. Nashem explained the proposed reconstruction of the fire damaged portion on the building in kind with alterations to the chimney and side vent details, revising some of the third-floor windows to improve emergency egress and window replacement of the entire building. Previous COAs LPB114/16, LPB 208/15 will also be implemented including paint color, roof materials, garbage enclosures, signage, lighting and landscaping. She said that ARC recommended that the specific design and manufacturer for the windows be submitted back to ARC for final review.

Applicant Comment:

Gary Blakesee, The Rise Trust, said all homes have been completed and signed off. Regarding the fire damage, they propose to restore the building to meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards but noted a preferred chimney modification and third-floor window with egress operation. He said they will come back with window manufacturer and installation details.

Michael Wishkoski, GGLO, provided drawing packets and said they have prototypes for rebuilding damaged elements; the north side is being used as a template for the south side. He said they still need to determine the extent of demolition needed where the two sides meet in the middle. He said they will have consistent siding across. He said the windows will be consistent to match what is there; they will be replicated in size, location and muntin. He said they propose to remove the trim and replace so all will be new. He said they will match existing corbel profile. He said they are replacing the gas fireplace and need to add venting; they will use the same chimney profile overall. He said they will change the width of the chimney a bit to fit the power vent. If there is no salvaged brick available, they will match brick and grout as closely as possible. He said venting will be painted black. He said the most damage occurred on the south elevation. He said the stone foundation will remain.

He said that on the east elevation the vent cap will come out the side of the building similar to the Montana Circle homes. He said the north side has the least damage. He said they propose to re-roof the entire house with previously approved material. He said everything will remain except the windows and window trim. He said ARC asked that the north side windows and detail be deferred.

Ms. Barker said at ARC a letter from the Landmarks Board was requested.

Ms. Nashem said she will work on that with them.

Mr. Wishkoski said they will work with Ms. Nashem on letter to SDCI.

Mr. Treffers asked about chimney expansion.

Mr. Wishkoski said the power vents require the spacing so the chimney had to expand to accommodate that.

Mr. Treffers asked about roof framing.

Mr. Wishkoski indicated on renderings and said that they will preserve as much as possible.

Ms. Patterson said it looks like they are rebuilding the south half and asked if they considered not doing it.

Mr. Wishkoski said they did but the intent of the SOI is to save as much as possible. He said they explored using a different style but because of the wholeness of the district and others who live there, this is the right approach.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Coney summarized what was proposed and said the chimney will be wider and they plan to come back on windows.

Mr. Kiel said typically the board doesn't approve of demolition of historic fabric but noted they will maintain window frames and trim until they have more information.

Mr. Wishkoski said they will begin demolition on the damaged side. He said they will hold off on window frames, trim and windows pending further consideration.

Ms. Barker noted ARC review and said changing the third-floor window from double hung to casement is a life-safety issue.

Ms. Nashem explained that a 2011 approval for additions over the back porches included casement windows.

Ms. Barker noted the precedent.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for 4204 and 4206 Washington Avenue West as per attached submittal: with deferred demolition of windows on the north half of the building and replacement details for windows will be submitted for ARC review and approval at later date.

- general approach to repairing the building in-kind
- chimney reconstruction with vent caps and side wall vent details
- revising some of the third-floor windows to improve emergency egress - revision of these (2) window types to casement in (8) third floor locations
- Approve project with deferred window replacement details submitted for ARC review and approval at later date

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Fort Lawton District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed restoration plans as presented June 7, 2017 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the buildings as specified in Ordinance #122750.

The other factors of SMC25.12.750 are not applicable

The Fort Lawton District Guidelines

DISTRICT-WIDE GUIDELINES

Building Form

Repair of building materials is preferred. If replacement is necessary, replacement must be in-kind.

Zone 3: WASHINGTON AVENUE (OFFICERS' ROW)

Building Materials

Repair of building materials is preferred. If replacement is necessary, replacement must be in kind.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

- 5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
- 6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
- 9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

MM/SC/ST/RK 11:0:0 Motion carried.

060717.32

Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co Bldg

1525 11th Ave

Proposed rehabilitation and new construction.

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, said the project is smaller than intended but they are happy with the end result and they have interested tenants.

Philip Bozarth-Drehen, Ankrom Moisan, oriented board members to the site /neighborhood via the site plan. He said that except for one original all windows have

been changed. He went over existing conditions. He said that there will be a setback of 21' at the top. He said that the building over the parking area and that over the landmark building will each have its own identity and scale. He walked through the packet, explaining detail. He said that the exterior is controlled but the interior is not but they plan to preserve some of the interior to preserve the pedestrian experience of looking in at the heavy timber structure. He said they will deconstruct the floor and ceiling of level one and the floor of level two. He said they will non-invasively clean the brick, scrape out the mortar and repoint to match original mortar. He said that the east wall is character defining. He said that the roof deck rail is not as prominent as earlier designed.

Mr. Bozarth-Drehen said that the building over the south parking lot will be crisp and contemporary with a durable feel. He said the windows will have black metal mullions which will contrast with the curtain wall on top. He said the window glazing will be green; there will be a curtain wall at the ground floor. He said that the original windows were Bear wood; they will restore the original window and create new windows to match.

Ms. Sodt explained that each window opening is a slightly different size.

Mr. Bozarth-Drehen said Ms. Sodt will write a letter exempting them from the Energy Code. He said the entry will be on 14th. He said that they will provide guidelines for tenants about signage allowance; they propose the maximum size signage for tenants, in the sign band, a maximum of 15 square feet; a blade over retail entry that will attach to new soffit framing and not the landmark. He said the curtain wall aims to recreate the feeling of historic plate glass windows only with a curtain wall system. He said the sconces are based on original design; they will mount new replica sconces to exact historic location. He said that on the west side of the building new concrete infill will be pushed in so the infill is visible; it will be painted.

Ms. Barker noted the homage to original use of the building with tire tread as shown on page 16. She said they have done a nice job responding to pull new building off landmark as much as possible. She noted the nice, sensitive details and nuanced features. She said the interior restoration of internal non-landmarked features is appreciated and the sign plan is appreciated.

Ms. Sodt said that there were no changes for a while; they were waiting SDCI decision on SEPA. She said they also went before the Design Review Board.

Ms. Barker said the west façade is not an alley, it is a property line.

Ms. Patterson asked if they looked at keeping the level one ceiling.

Mr. Bozarth-Drehen said there was no way to make it work; they had to deconstruct and rebuild.

Ms. Sodt said that the first floor was full of creosote so remediation was required.

Mr. Kiel said it is a good solution.

Ms. Patterson asked about documentation and storage plans.

Mr. McCullough said they will photograph, catalog and put it back right. He said that some pieces may need replacement.

Ms. Sodt asked that plan be shared for the file.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Vyhnanek asked if retail signage will be at new entry points.

Mr. Bozarth-Drehen said yes. He said that there were three entrances in 1917 and 1937; now there are just two real entrances. He said they will keep the two but reconfigured; they will add the third back in. He said they will use existing mortar joints for signage.

Ms. Patterson noted they are bringing true divided lights windows to huge fan window.

Mr. Bozarth-Drehen said they have been working with Bear Windows.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the new addition, partial demolition, and rehabilitation, including the signage plan (*signage that complies with plan can be reviewed administratively*) as described in the application submittal, at 1525 11th Avenue. In addition, the Board supports the building code official's ability to modify the energy code requirements to allow for the replication of historic window sash in the openings where the historic windows are missing.

This action is based on the following:

1. In regards to *SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significance change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Designation Report*: While the proposal includes partial demolition, a twenty-foot setback of the addition from the 11th Avenue elevation is proposed, therefore the primary elevation and views of the building will not be adversely affected by the proposal.
2. In regards to *SMC 25.12.750 B, The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner*: The applicant has responded positively to feedback provided by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to explore the maximum set back of the new addition on the roof, as well as the compatibility of the design of the new construction with the historic building--the design has evolved to incorporate ARC feedback.
3. The other factors of *SMC 25.12 .750 C and 25.12.750 D* are not applicable at this time in the process.

MM/SC/RK/DB 10:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Treffers opposed.

060717.33

The Rainier Club

820 Fourth Avenue

Proposed alterations to meet fire-code requirements.

Ron Wright explained life-safety exiting for the building are at the back (east) side, along the alley way directly adjacent to the FUMC and new Tower. He said they are required to have one-hour fire protection for any opening along that walkway. It is not visible from any right of way. The windows are filled on the inside so are no longer active; they will install fake shutters.

Suni Hatcher said they will install an overhead coiling door; the jambs are set back 8” on either side of the brick masonry that will allow for window maintenance. She said the fire escape will have fire-rated glazing installed and the infill will be converted to one-hour rated CMU or brick to match. She said the one mechanical louver will have an internal fire damper installed.

Ms. Johnson said ARC reviewed and noted it was reasonable. She said it is a life-safety issue and is non-visible.

Ms. Barker said it is not visible.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for exterior alterations at the Rainier Club at 810 4th Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 113459 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/DB/EV 11:0:0 Motion carried.

060717.4

DESIGNATIONS

060717.41

Colonnade Hotel/Gatewood Apartments

107 Pine Street

Larry Johnson and Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, presented. Mr. Johnson said the building is National Register eligible.

Ms. Mirro presented via PowerPoint (in DON file). She provided context of the site and the neighborhood. She said the four-story URM Hotel was built in 1900. It was seismically upgraded in 1990 with steel brace frames. She said that the west and north façades are both primary. She said that all storefronts have been replaced. She said the board requested evidence of alteration connected to Regrade. She noted that the north façade was rebuilt 7' to the south, eliminating two windows. She said that a cast iron column on the corner is from a 1911 remodel. She said there is common brick on the alley as well as a patchwork of board form work when the alley was lowered. Responding to board question about why the window heads on the alley were arched she said the arch might have been a cheaper way to go. She said the south side façade is blank and noted the light well there. She said the 1904-05 maps show skylights here early on. The 1950 Sanborn map shows the office has moved and the four skylights remain. She noted the 1904 shows the building occupied the north edge of downtown; the Regrade work was ongoing. She said in 1908 photo of Pine Street shows the street paved but not widened; the building was unaltered. She noted a keystone remains.

Mr. Coney noted the presence of awnings on the building in early photos.

Ms. Mirro said that windows were removed and two were relocated. She said the cornice changed, crenellations were removed. She said the building was renamed "Gatewood". In 1955 the cornice was gone, 1970's the transoms were boarded; she said she didn't know if the originals are behind the boards. She said in 1990 the building was operating as low-income apartments; new storefronts were added and mechanical and seismic upgrades were done. She said the building got all new upper floor glazing in the same configuration and organization.

She said that the building may qualify for nomination on Standards C, D, and F. She said that criteria A and B are not relevant but that the building meets C in its connection to the development of expansion of central business district and the Regrade. She noted the soil line on the north façade and photo showing the building up against the regrade. She said regrades occurred from 1898 – 1903, and from 1906 – 1911; 3,000,000 cubic yards were removed. She said the building can convey this history by physical marks on the building and widening of the road during which the northern portion of the building was removed.

She said the building is a mixed-use with street level retail and SRO / Hotel use above. She provided additional information about this building type and said the Felker House, which was a hotel and brothel; the Occidental was the premier Hotel at the time. She said from 1898 – 1963 there were tourist and residential hotels along 1st Avenue; there was a boom in 1910 related to the AYP. She said the Cadillac and Eastern hotels were working man hotels; they were SRO mixed use buildings with double loaded corridors and small rooms. She said the Panama Hotel, in the Chinatown-International District, was associated with Japanese Americans and is on the National Register. She said the NP Hotel was worker housing. She noted the Publix, Scargo, and Ace hotels as other examples of the type. She said that after a 1970s file the building type was almost lost when increased safety measures were required and buildings owners were reluctant to implement them. She said the Colonnade made the transition and remained an SRO.

Ms. Mirro said the building was an early work of Charles Bebb and James Shack but is not an outstanding example. She said the building is on a corner and stands out; she said it has two facades and may or may not meet Criterion F.

Mr. Coney asked if government funds were used to restore the building and if any covenants remain.

Ms. Sodt said she suspects there were Federal funds and Section 106 review. She said there must not have been a time period required for low income units, usually it is fifty years.

Ms. Mirro said the building qualifies for National Register but it has gone back and forth on eligibility.

Ms. Barker asked if there is evidence of remaining crenellation on west side under the coping.

Mr. Johnson said he hasn't seen it.

Mr. Sneddon asked why they didn't carry the ground floor and second floor sheet metal banding all the way across.

Ms. Mirro said she was trying to figure that out as well.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Johnson said the building tells the story of the Regrade and that she supported designation on criteria C and D.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He said there are so many interesting marks on the building connected to Seattle during its development history. He noted the building is characteristic of SRO building. He said the landmark process isn't able to convey the context to other buildings and resources around it but said this site is a portal to Pike Place Market area.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation on criteria C and D and said it tells the story and brings the Regrade to life – especially on Pine Street. He wasn't sure about Criterion F.

Ms. Patterson supported designation on criteria C, D, E, but not F.

Ms. Durham supported designation on criteria C and D but not E and F. She noted the association with Regrade, SRO as prominent part of history.

Mr. Treffers supported designation on criteria C, D, and maybe E.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C, D. She said the lobby relocated many times and this adds to the SRO story – a tourist didn't need to know where the entrance was.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on criteria C, and D. He said it was a great report and appreciated stories about the building's relationship to the redevelopment of the city.

Mr. Coney supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He noted the association with the Regrade and its proximity to Pike Place Market. He noted the building is kitty corner from the Eitel Building.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported designation on criteria C and D. She appreciated Ms. Mirro's further investigation; she said it is a fascinating building and story.

Mr. Kiel supported designation on criteria C and D.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Colonnade Hotel/Gatewood Apartments at 107 Pine Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building.

MM/SC//EV/KJ 11:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Ketcherside left at 5:25 pm.

The following items were reviewed out of agenda order.

060717.6 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES

060717.61 Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store
400 Westlake Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the request for extension to October 18, 2017; she supported the request.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of the Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store, 400 Westlake Avenue, to October 18, 2017.

MM/SC/RC/KJ 10:0:0 Motion carried.

060717.62 Eldridge Tire Co. Building
1519 Broadway

Ms. Sodt said the ownership is wrapping up a large project and asked for an extension. She said they are looking at which items will be reviewed administratively; she said there should be a signed agreement within a year.

Ellen Mirro said they will know more in three months.

Ms. Sodt said she has made suggestions and things are moving on Controls.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of the Eldridge Tire Co. Building, 1519 Broadway, for three months.

MM/SC/DB/EV 10:0:0 Motion carried.

060717.4 DESIGNATIONS (continued)

060717.42 Rodgers Tile Company Building
117 Yale Avenue North

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, noted the board had been on a tour of the building. He said the Staff Report recommends not designating the building.

David Peterson, NK Architects, provided context and history of the area. He said the area was developed in the 1890s and there were lots of ethnic groups – many from eastern Europe. He said the site housed the Margaret Pontius house which later became Ryther Children’s Home. He said the once residential area became more industrial. In 1917, Pacific Telephone and Telegraph constructed the north part of this building in an American Renaissance Revival style. He said that Charles Rodgers bought the building and the lot next door and constructed the left side of the building. He occupied the building until 1940. Rodgers Tile supplied the Olympic Hotel terrazzo. He sold Malibu tile which existed only a few years; it was the earliest industry in Malibu, California. He said the decorative tile was handmade and colored. He said that all the tile on this building was from Malibu.

Mr. Peterson said the Italian Renaissance Revival Style was used; Rodgers took the existing building and added to it in an eclectic way. He said that by 1940 the business was gone, Rodgers retired; there were a series of other owners. In 1942, Andrew Willatsen was hired to do alterations to the building; much of the work was not carried out but the drawing notes state to ‘remove all tile and plaster’. He said that 1996 alterations fixed water damage and sill damage; sill panel, decorative panels and crest were removed. In the rear of the building they replaced the stucco with horizontal wood siding and a window was added. He said in the back of the building there are two main industrial openings. He said the remaining tile was damaged; all headers were replaced, and red and black tiles were replaced when putting in vinyl windows. He said the owner recollected there were other tile replacements. He said tile remains in the vestibule. He noted O. B. Williams and A. M. Radiator as other trade related buildings.

Responding to board questions at the nomination meeting he explained the Rodgers did a lot of work on apartment buildings. He said he presumed work done in the Smith Tower basement was done by Rodgers. He said that Malibu Tile upstairs at the Paramount Theater was sourced by a competitor, Robinson Tile. He said that another competitor, William Kellogg, was a premier company and served the artist end of the business. Kellogg supplied for Arts and Crafts movement and custom work, carried Rookwood, and did the tile work at the Sorrento Hotel. He said that Robinson Tile lasted until the 1950s; installations include the Wilsonian Apartments, Olympic Hotel, Paramount theater, and Children’s Hospital. He said the hygienic aspect of tile was pushed. Other local tile businesses included Gladding McBean and

Seattle Pottery. Mr. Peterson said that the Seattle Landmark, M. V. Malibu was, at one time, owned by the Rindge family, founders of Malibu Pottery. He said the yacht was later owned, coincidentally, by a Seattle owner; the yacht is unrelated to Rodgers Tile.

Mr. Peterson provided comparison drawings indicating alterations to the building: tiles removed, removal of double arched entry. He said there has been an enormous amount of material – and integrity – lost.

Mr. McCullough said there is nothing significant architecturally; Rodgers was just one of many tile sellers; nothing significant about manufacturer; no double significance of Criterion C; and there is no integrity.

Owner John Ahler said he and his family purchased the building in the 1980s; they have managed everything. He said the two buildings were cobbled together and there is no integrity. He said they want to realize their investment in the property.

Public Comment:

Max Baker, Cascade Neighborhood, said the building tells the early history of Seattle. He said this building plays a role of identifiable Cascade buildings. He noted the juxtaposition to the hyper modern buildings and he said the building gives a sense of history of the area and the larger story. He said there have been changes but there is still enough there.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Treffers said he stopped by the building and there is still tile and it is fairly prominent.

Ms. Johnson said there is tile but there is not a lot of it.

Ms. Barker said her favorite part is the tile that part of a vent, constructed with voids. She said there is not much there.

Mr. Hodgins said there is not much there.

Ms. Vyhnanek said there are significant changes to the vestibule; you can see where the entry has shifted.

Mr. Coney said the building has always stuck out in the area. He said the two buildings – one Rodgers built and then he added ornamentation – meets Criterion C. He noted the newspaper article which called Rodgers the “oldest tile firm in the Northwest”. He noted Rodgers had significant installations. He noted the Malibu tile on the outside. He said the Tuscany is one of the premier installation but Rodgers did more.

Ms. Vyhnanek did not support designation and said there is no double significance of Criterion C which was the most applicable.

Ms. Barker appreciated hearing the Malibu Tile story and the history of tile bathrooms and kitchens for common folk. She said that Andrew Willatsen started the downward spiral of this building; the integrity was eroded early. She said the owner did what he needed to do. She said that the building doesn't have the integrity for designation nor does it shout out 'Cascade Neighborhood'.

Mr. Treffers appreciated the care the owner put into the building and said he understands the economic aspect. He said the Ordinance does not look at economic aspect and directs the board to apply the criteria of significance and if it can convey that. He said it can. He said the building is associated with the construction and tile business in the 1920s which was significant. He said that Rodgers redeveloped the building for his business and showroom; the application of tile to the exterior was a big component. He supported designation on Criterion C.

Ms. Durham appreciated the report details and the thorough follow-up. She noted the connection to the tile industry and residential development but said there was not sufficient integrity to designate. She hoped the remaining tile could be salvaged.

Ms. Patterson said half the tile is missing but there is tile remaining and the buildings are clearly associated with the Rodgers Tile. She said the tile conveys the significance of Rodgers Tile to the cultural aspect of the City. She said the building illustrates the growth of the industry, with Rodgers moving into this building and adding to it. She said there were only three of these companies in the directory at this time. She said tile was significant to the Arts and Crafts movement.

Mr. Hodgins said there was no double significance and did not support designation.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the roof was originally tile.

Mr. Peterson said it was but had been changed.

Mr. Sneddon said the board cannot consider future use or economic impacts, only the building as it stands before the board. He said that the building doesn't meet criteria C and D. He noted the important aspect of early twentieth Century architectural detailing in apartments and residence. Rodgers wasn't the only representative of tile work here and wasn't a great representation. He said the building was an unusual building which represents early Pacific Telephone and Telegraph building. He said it is an adaptation and note a great one. He said the building is missing too many elements and he did not support designation.

Ms. Johnson did not support designation because of lack of integrity.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation and said there was no double significance.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Rodgers Tile Company Building at 117 Yale Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard C; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building.

060717.5 NOMINATION**060717.51 Pacific Architect & Builder
1945 Yale Place East**

Andy Phillips, Docomomo WeWa, presented the nomination (report in DON file). He provided context of the building and site and noted there are other modernist commercial building examples in the neighborhood but chose this one to nominate at this time. He said the building is associated with Pacific Architect and Builder Magazine, architect A. O. Bumgardner and structural engineer Jack Christiansen, and for its design, construction and innovative techniques.

He provided an overview of Modernism which started in Europe and caught on here after WWII. This concrete structure was built for the Printer's Building and Equipment Company, an entity formed to print the published materials of Pacific Builder and Engineer (PB&E). PB&E was founded in 1902 and published the *Construction News Bulletin* to cover construction news in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana and Alaska. He said that in July 1954, inspired by the words of Pietro Belluschi, the magazine was renamed Pacific Architect and Builder to reflect the Pacific Northwest as a leader in expression of modernist architecture.

Mr. Phillips said that A. O. Bumgardner's work was a frequent focus of the magazine. He was a member of AIA – Chapter President and Treasurer. He said Bumgardner drafted the Ordinance for the creation of the Pioneer Square Preservation District. He was named Architectural Advisor to raise the editorial standards of the magazine.

He said that the building was constructed in 1960 to be the new headquarter building for the magazine and publisher. He said the building has three levels following the sloped topography. He said that Christiansen designed the structure, highlighted by the thin shell concrete roof form. He went over the construction techniques and said thin shell concrete roofs became widespread. He said that four-part movable forms were used – they were durable forms that could be reusable. It was innovative construction system that reduced the cost of project. He said that in 1959 Christiansen partnered with Maury Proctor to develop a shell formwork company.

Susan Boyle, Docomomo WeWa explained she interviewed Christiansen years ago. She said he was engaged in new ways to analyze structure. She said he learned from early Europeans and brought innovation into new projects. She noted the efficiency, clarity, and simplicity of line in concrete technology.

Mr. Phillips said the journal started operating in the building before construction was complete. He noted the order and unity of the building and the overall sense of volume. He said the building meets criteria D, E, and F. He said that this building was a turning point in Bumgardner's career between residential and commercial. He said that Christiansen developed this technique and efficiencies in construction. He said the building is a neighborhood icon and has a sense of drama.

Ms. Boyle said the building also meets the double significance of C; it is the home of a periodical on modern architecture. She said the building has a new owner.

Ms. Barker asked for clarification on the roof.

Mr. Phillips said it is a hyperbolic paraboloid roof – like a vault with arches in two directions.

Mr. Treffers asked the history of this form.

Ms. Boyle said it originated in the 1920s and 1930s and was a theoretical form of design, another idea on thin form. She noted Candela's work. She said they were using drawings as analytic method.

Ms. Barker asked about the half timbering above the big window.

Mr. Phillips said there is a tighter mullion pattern and glazing is translucent and some transparent.

Mr. Sneddon asked why they used wood cladding under the window.

Mr. Phillips said that wood is prominent in Northwest Architecture; he thought they tried to mix wood with the concrete. He said the lower floor is heavier post and beam.

Jack McCullough said he had nothing to add. He said the owner has goals for the property and asked that the vacant parcel adjacent to the west not be included in the nomination.

Molly Mahan, W.G. Clark Construction, said their company has operated since 1910 and they have been in the same building since 1923. She said that they like this building but landmarking it was not on their mind when they bought it, and they do not support the nomination. She said they hope that someday it could be sold and not at a loss to the company. She said Mr. Phillips had contacted her about the nomination. She said they want a configuration that works for them and they want flexibility of use for their business. She said they need parking on the adjacent parcel. She said they have a permit for interior work to take all the walls out. She said they are voluntarily doing seismic upgrades and adding three small windows in cmu portion for offices.

Ellen Mirro, the Johnson Partnership, presented PowerPoint on the owner's behalf, with photos showing what the building looks like now. She went over character defining features. She showed alterations to the interior including where lighting was installed and minor damage where blinds were removed.

Ms. Doherty clarified that Docomomo WeWa report originally had just included Parcel A. But her further research discovered the two parcels were tied together in Legal Description she found in King County records. It has since been demonstrated that the original building and use of the site for the Pacific Architect & Builder was

associated with only the single east parcel. Therefore she recommends inclusion of Parcel A only.

Ms. Barker asked about blank walled components on original building CMU section.

Mr. Philips said it was primarily storage and mechanical.

Ms. Boyle said the wall just reflected the use behind.

Ms. Doherty said she is aware of the ongoing building permits. The nomination could not be scheduled quickly enough to be done in advance of the building permit, and it was not appropriate to interfere with their process. She said the owners have made adjustments to their design to mitigate impact to the historic building. They hired an architect to advise them, and for the three small windows they aligned the rough openings with the cmu module so that it may be more easily reversed in the future. In response to a question from the Board, she said that SDCI did not make a mistake, SEPA was not triggered by the proposed project.

Ms. Johnson asked about the radiant floors.

Ms. Mahan said they are not functioning.

Mike Ducey, W.G. Clark Construction, said the radiators work but the floors do not.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, Docomomo WEWA, said it is an obvious landmark and meets criteria C, D, E and F. She noted the oral history of Christiansen and said they have a PDF of that and will post it on their website. She said Historic Seattle owns eight landmark buildings; they understand the process and it is not onerous. She supported exterior features, interior volume is important and the clerestory windows.

Brooke Best, Historic Seattle, spoke in support of nomination and thanked Ms. Boyle, Mr. Phillips, and Docomomo WEWA. She said the presentation was informative. She said it was an important time in the City's history. She noted Docomomo WEWA's advocacy of post-war resources.

Ms. Barker asked board members for their thoughts on the entry.

Ms. Johnson said the exterior and interior are closely connected; it is difficult to make a change because one impacts the other. She noted an air duct.

Ms. Mahan said there is a lot of HVAC on the exterior now.

Mr. Sneddon noted the careful aim at creating open space, sensitivity of lighting and natural light inward. He said they minimized any structural elements which are intrinsically attached to design. He said they need sensitivity to control the partitioned space. He said the top and bottom of the roof are important as are the structural elements between the third floor.

Mr. Hodgins said he has four projects with W. C. Clark so he would recuse himself.

Ms. Patterson said to include 3rd floor interiors.

Ms. Doherty asked them to clarify if their intent was to include the visible form of the underside of the roof.

Mr. Sneddon said that clerestories would be protected by exterior.

Ms. Durham supported nomination.

Mr. Treffers supported nomination of Parcel A including the exterior and interior as described here, and entryway.

Ms. Doherty said there is no entry vestibule per se.

Mr. Treffers said they could trim down at the end and said to include the main entryway. He said it is a beautiful structure wrapped in a glass wall.

Ms. Barker supported nomination.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported nomination.

Mr. Coney supported nomination.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the “Pacific Architect & Builder” Building at 1945 Yale Place East for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the portion of the site described as Parcel A, and the exterior of the building; and the interior roof/ceiling from the springpoint of the vaults upward; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for July 19, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/DB/EV 9:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Hodgins recused himself.

060717.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator