



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 50/16

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, January 6, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson
Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Kathleen Durham
Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel
Aaron Luoma
Julianne Patterson
Matthew Sneddon

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Jeffrey Murdock
Mike Stanley

Acting Vice-Chair, Aaron Luoma called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

010616.1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
November 18, 2015
Deferred.

010616.2 **CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

010616.21 Seattle Tower

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

1218 Third Avenue
Proposed louver installation

Maria Pope explained that HVAC installation necessitates the installation of louvers in existing windows.

Ms. Sodt explained they are removing glazing only.

Ms. Pope said that the sash and frame will all be intact.

Mr. Kiel said to make sure they waterproof.

Ms. Pope assured that they will and said that the way the louvers are tilted will resist water intrusion.

Mr. Ketcherside arrived at 3:34 pm.

Ms. Barker asked how they plan to do it.

Ms. Pope said that they will pull the full window out and put the same type glass back in with louver – only it will be shorter.

Ms. Barker said it seemed logical and most changes are not visible. She said it is just one floor and noted the need to think holistically about tenancy in the future.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said the scale of louvers in relation to the height and bulk of building is small and the color blends in.

Mr. Kiel said that he preferred the blue route but it is so high up and it is reversible.

Ms. Barker said she worried about precedent on primary façade.

Mr. Luoma said he didn't feel strongly either way.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed window louvers with the stove hood exhaust at the preferred location at the Seattle Tower, 1212 Third 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 Report on Designation 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/NC/DB 10:0:0 Motion carried.

010616.22

John B. Allen School / Brick Building
6532 Phinney Avenue North
Proposed GWB overlay at ceilings of Floors 1 and 2

Hannah Allender, SHKS, explained the intent to encapsulate lead paint plaster with gypsum board. She said that after the removal of the acoustic ceiling tiles there will be a 1 ½” net change in ceiling height in the hallways and classrooms; accommodated new furring and GWB.

Ms. Barker noted that the beams remain visible.

Ms. Allender said that it is just to the area of the new elevator lobby. She said that the original project is underway and it has expanded into the larger hallway.

Ms. Doherty said the GWB will receive a smooth finish to look more like plaster.

Mr. Sneddon asked if they were taking the tiles off.

Ms. Allender said they are.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said she was concerned about the hallway modification and said that this feel like further erosion of a well-retained corridor.

Mr. Ketcherside said that it is just the ceiling and he would approve removal of the tiles to return to original plaster finish. He noted the lead issue and said that what is planned seems reasonable; 1-1/2” is not too severe. He said this just extends approval to the hallway and classrooms.

Mr. Carter asked if the 15’-6” is floor to floor height.

Ms. Allender said it is.

Mr. Carter said that 1-1/2” is not a big deal.

Mr. Luoma agreed.

Mr. Sneddon said it brings a more cohesive look.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed ceiling alterations at the John B. Allen School - Brick Building, 6532 Phinney Avenue North, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed ceiling alterations affect the features specified in Ordinance No. 123845, as the work will cover historic fabric. However, the proposal is intended to mitigate the overall impact to the building, and is intended to be done in general with compliance with Standard #s 9 & 10 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/RK 10:0:0 Motion carried.

010616.23 Seattle Brewing & Malting Co. Malt House
5840 Airport Way South
Proposed exterior ramp and stairs

Kara Anderson, Sabey, explained that there are two different parts to the Malt House; the north and south sides do not connect. She said the south portion does not have an ADA entry. She said there are multiple entries off the alley and they will use the middle door. She said they will build concrete stairs that are pulled away from building. There is a 12" gap between the building and the stairs; the handrail and landing will connect to building. She said they will paint the handrails to match the existing exterior trim color. The simple design of the handrail will tie in with the existing openings.

Ms. Doherty said that Fran's Chocolates is in the Brew House and this area is directly across the alley from there.

Sandra Suskic, Sabey, said the alley is perpendicular to the main street and the ramp is not very visible from there because it's set back. She said there are about six risers at the stair. She said it looks at an internal courtyard and the ramp is minimal.

Ms. Patterson asked if they will match the concrete color.

Ms. Suskic said they will try to match the older darker concrete at the end of property by adding lamp black to the mix.

Mr. Luoma asked about the need for the ramp.

Ms. Anderson said that it is an isolated suite on the property and there are various floor levels internally. The proposed ramp is the only way to provide accessible access to the space.

Mr. Kiel asked if the stairs are original.

Ms. Anderson said that it looks like there was a window there at some point, and the opening was changed to a doorway.

Ms. Doherty said that the new stair is separate and not cast against the building, so it is easily removable in the future if needed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Kiel said it is sensible and it is pulled away from the building fabric.

Ms. Barker said it is reasonable.

Mr. Luoma said it is a clearly modern addition.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior ramp and stair at the Malt House of the Seattle Brewing & Malting Co., at 5840 Airport Way South, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior ramp and stair do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 116973 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/RK/MSN 10:00 Motion carried.

010616.3 DESIGNATION

010616.31 Maritime Building
911 Western Avenue

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Mr. Carter disclosed that works with the spouse of a contract employee associated with the project.

Mr. McCullough said he had no objection to Mr. Carter's participation. He asked the board not to designate the property which was denied designation by a former board in 2008. He said the building is intact but not special. He said that the board requested additional information which will be presented.

David Peterson prepared and presented the report (full nomination report on DON file). He provided context of the building now and historically. He said that the area developed as the Commission District where middle men purchased produce and then distributed / sold it. He said that the Great Fire started across the street; the area was immediately rebuilt with lots of little shed-type buildings to get working again. He said that slowly masonry structures were built. He said the site was purchased from the railroad company; he noted its proximity to the waterfront. He said that the building housed various tenants over time and that the Commission companies started to break up when Pike Place Market started operating.

He explained that the concrete structure with post and beam interior is five stories. He said that the floors are 12' with 16.5' first floor height. He said the building used to face Western; it had commercial storefronts on three sides and small loading docks on the west side. He said that 2/3 of the windows have been replaced in-kind with wood sash although there are some vinyl. He said that alterations include the retail level storefronts, first floor, tile and mosaic was added in 1970s and there have been major interior changes.

Mr. Peterson said that the windows cluster into groups and are separated by punched openings. He said there are three main entries. He said there is a rear freight elevator with secondary stair. He said that the building floor design allows for flexibility and various occupants; a corridor was added to link the three sections. He said that original wood floor is still in place. He provided photos of nearby similar period structures: Polson, National, Seattle Hardware, Schwabacher, and the Olympic Warehouse buildings and said that the Maritime is not unique.

He said that E. W. Houghton was known for designing theaters as well as the Terry Denny Building, Moore Theater; he did a lot of large buildings. He said that Stone and Webster were best known for constructing electrical utilities but also had a construction arm.

Mr. Peterson said that the Maritime housed a variety of businesses over the years and there was no pattern to the types of businesses. I. F. Laucks occupied space here for 20 years but the main manufacturing was done elsewhere. He noted that United Airlines accounting section was housed in the building for a time. He explained that the Colman Building housed a broad

variety of firms that were more related to the maritime industry – maritime insurance. He said the Polson building is smaller and housed lots of printers and publishers. He said that National Building was another Commission District building; ½ housed furs and furriers and was a center of the fur business.

He said the board asked if the building acted as a gateway to downtown and he said that was subjective; he said it was not intended to be such and was just one of the many buildings on the waterfront. He said that there are many more examples of reinforced concrete buildings in Seattle; it was a common technique and this was nothing new. He said that the building did not meet any of the criteria for designation. It housed a variety of business tenants; it is a simple utilitarian building that would fit in a district but not be a landmark on its own. He said it occupies a full block but is not prominent.

Mr. McCullough said that the building meets none of the criteria and asked the board not to designate.

Ms. Barker asked the number of extant buildings associated with the Commission District.

Mr. Peterson said there are some in varying states of integrity – five or six.

Mr. McCullough said that this building missed the Commission District era.

Mr. Peterson said that when Pike Place Market opened the Commission decreased.

Mr. Luoma asked about west side loading and if it was built for certain use in relation to railroad.

Mr. Peterson noted the Ainsworth and Dunn Building's associated warehouse and the chaos of merchandise coming in from ships. He said some railroad track side spurs were added but that most of this work was done by hand or small equipment such as winches, wagons.

Mr. Luoma asked how these small loading docks compare to other Commission buildings.

Mr. Peterson said that the Polson Building has a similar arrangement and the docks are not for huge goods coming in and out.

Ms. Patterson said that the building is not called the Maritime Building on the drawings and asked where the name came from.

Mr. Peterson said that it was the Pacific Warehouse Building when built and the name changed pretty early on.

Public Comment:

Brooke Best, Historic Seattle, supported designation and said that it meets Criterion D. She said it embodies early 20th Century warehouse building. She said that it is intact and it reads the same as when built. She noted the symmetrical window bays that are still largely intact. She said it is a good example and representative of its style.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Sneddon said that it is not straightforward but that he supported designation based on Criterion C. He said it is significant in its association with the history and growth of the waterfront, commission District, development of ports and the railroad. He said it representative of a transitional building; anticipation of changes in the area allowed for flexibility of tenancy. He noted the loading docks and structure as well as the interior design were done in anticipation of the future. He said that the windows have been replaced in-kind and read the same as original windows. He said the building really stands out and he noted it represents warehouse construction. He said it is a hybrid structure of concrete and post and beam. He said that the floor loading was good for supporting printing companies etc. He said the building attracted a wide clientele.

Ms. Patterson supported designation on criteria C, D, and F and said she echoed Mr. Sneddon's comments. She noted the economic history and the diversity of occupants noting the adaptability. She said it is rare to find such a maintained flexibility of use. She supported Criterion D and said that it embodies the eclectic commercial warehouse and is representative of its period in time. She said it is honest of its time with no unnecessary ornamentation. She noted the simplicity and lack of ornament. She said it doesn't have to be high style. She said that changes are insignificant and the windows were replaced in-kind. She said that she supported Criterion F based on the sheer size of the city block size building. She said it makes it recognizable and prominent on the waterfront. She said the waterfront connection will be reinforced when the viaduct comes down.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support designation noting that it doesn't rise to landmark status.

Ms. Johnson said that she works close to the building and there are many warehouses; she said they are handsome buildings that are simple and honest. She said that the building embodies its time. She wasn't sure if she supported designation.

Ms. Dunham supported designation. She supported Criterion C. She said the building is simple and honest. She noted the various tenants and the flexibility of use over time. She supported Criterion D and said that it is not high style but it is emblematic of its style. She noted the in-kind window replacement.

Mr. Carter did not support designation and said the building is not significant. He said that it is an adaptable warehouse office building. He said it is simple and utilitarian building that does what it was built to do but that others have more to offer.

Ms. Barker supported designation. She supported Criterion D. She said it is a simple pure and intact building. She said it is a whole block building and is easily identifiable.

Ms. Anderson said the building has served the same purpose for a long time. She said it is intact and is clearly utilitarian in style. She said it may meet Criterion D but she wasn't sure.

Mr. Luoma said it is on the waterfront and he noted those industry and significant connections to the City are crucial. He said that the building has high integrity despite store front changes which, he said, are typical. He said the building didn't house maritime industries but that maybe it got lucky with its flexibility. He said that it does appear that it was designed with association with the working waterfront. He supported designation on Criterion C because of its association with the waterfront industry. He said it served a role and served others on waterfront. He said that it is a distinctly a warehouse building and it has high integrity and can convey that.

Mr. Ketcherside said he was not convinced there was a direct connection to waterfront activities unlike the Colman Building that had Alaskan trade related activities.

Ms. Johnson said she would support designation on Criterion D because the building is intact and distinctive.

Mr. Sneddon said it was a unique architectural chapter compared to others such as the Colman or Polson buildings. He said that the reinforced concrete construction allowed for wider window groupings. He said that it is a stripped down modern warehouse using new technology.

Ms. Anderson said that it is distinctive and visible and embodies the utilitarian warehouse. She said she would support designation on Criterion D.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Maritime Building at 911 Western Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/DB/KD 7:2:1 Motion carried. Messrs. Carter and Ketcherside opposed. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

010616.4 NOMINATION

010616.41 Lincoln High School
4400 Interlake Avenue North

Mr. Kiel left the meeting.

Ms. Dunham disclosed that her daughter attends a program at the building.

Lucy Morello and Rich Hill had no objection to her participation.

Lucy Morello, Seattle Public Schools, noted the plans to renovate and reopen as a High School in 2019.

Ellen Mirro, Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and the building. She did a virtual 'walk around the building' via photos. She reported that the original building was constructed in 1907 by James Stephen, district architect. Additions were made in 1914 by Edgar Blair (then district architect), 1931 by Floyd Naramore (then district architect), and NBBJ in 1958.

She said that there have been many changes to the building over time and noted the Jacobean parapet was missing perhaps as a result of the 1949 earthquake. She said that many windows have been replaced. She said that there was a roof leak in the central wing which caused the floors to collapse and had to be rebuilt. She said that slate stair treads wore out and were replaced with plastic magnesite. She said that stair rails were altered to add height to meet Code and that Masonite panels were temporarily attached to guardrails. She said that partitions around stairs, lighting, trim and finishes were replaced. She said that there are lots of mature trees close to the foundation of the Blair addition.

Ms. Mirro said that the former auditorium in the Blair addition is now a resource room. She noted the original clock, and original water fountain with Batchelder tile, and the boy's gymnasium and elevated running track. She said the greenhouse at the Naramore addition was removed. She said the large study hall was divided up. She said that the building may or may not meet the criteria for designation. She noted that Warren Littlejohn was the first African American teacher in the state, and taught here. She said that the development of the education system is significant as was the development of the school district and the district architects. She said the building shows the trend from district architects to use of an outside architectural firm. She said the building may be significant in the development of the Wallingford/Latona community. She said that there

are many parts of the building and the board would have to decide which if any have integrity. She said the building shows the evolution of school design.

Ms. Mirro said that James Stephen was the first district architect and after leaving the school district he designed the YMCA and many churches, fire stations and residences. She said that Edgar Blair became district architect when Stephen left. She said he was there for nine years and went into private practice. Floyd Naramore was district architect from 1919-1935 and built 24 new schools. When he left the school district he became one of the partners at NBBJ, which became one of the largest design firms on the west coast.

Ms. Mirro said that the 1914 building entry is visible and is best viewed from side streets.

Ms. Dunham asked about replacement windows.

Lorne McConachie, Bassetti Architects, responded that residential grade Pella wood windows were used. He said that there are some original windows on the north (Blair) addition.

Ms. Morello said the auditorium windows are in bad shape.

Ms. Barker asked which criteria were used for West Seattle High School.

Ms. Doherty said it may have been C, D or E – it is usually one or more of those three at many of the designated schools.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the baffles at the clerestory windows in the sawtooth roof of the NBBJ buildings.

Ms. Mirro said they were part of the original design.

Ms. Barker asked about the parapet on the older buildings.

Ms. Johnson said that it came down after the earthquake and said that the loss of the parapet was not mentioned in news coverage. She said the damage doesn't show up until a later assessment.

Mr. Luoma asked why two clerestories at the NBBJ buildings are oriented north and two are oriented south.

Ms. Mirro said she didn't know.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the boiler room and if the original boiler was there.

Ms. Doherty clarified that the boiler rooms are referred to in the nomination application as 1914, and if they are from 1911 the report would have to be amended.

Ms. Mirro said they are from 1911 right after they repaired fire damage.

Mr. Luoma asked about integrity of the boys' gym and track.

Mr. McConachie said the seismic bracing runs through it.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Anderson supported nomination of exteriors of 1907, 1914 and 1931 buildings and said they tell the story visually of the growth of school and neighborhood.

Ms. Barker supported nomination of the 1907, 1914, and 1931 portions. She said they give homage to what came before. She wished the parapet was not removed. She requested a tour of the property.

Mr. Carter said the 1907 building has interior issues and the 1931 is not great. He said that three buildings built by three district architects show the growth of the district and schools. He said it is worth nominating. He said the 1958 addition is not the best work of NBBJ; he noted the monitors oriented in two different directions. He supported nomination of the 1907, 1914, and 1931 buildings only.

Ms. Durham supported nomination of the 1907, 1914 and 1931 portions. She said they show the history of Seattle schools and the evolution of the building. She said the marriage of the three wings is interesting although complicated. She said the 1914 section is lovely although the windows are in bad shape. She said the former auditorium and library are lovely spaces.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination of the 1907, 1914, and 1931 portions only. She said it is an interesting story in context of growth of the school district.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and said it is unfortunate how much has been altered at the interior. He suggested including the boys' gym and track.

Ms. Patterson agreed but said in general she doesn't like picking and choosing aspects to nominate because it alters the sense of history. She said the 1958 building was built to address a deficiency. She said all should be included and then narrowed down later.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination. He said it is important to include the 1958 portion and to look at the gym in 1958 compared to 1914. He noted the expression of architectural values over time is evident.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination and said the building tells the history of district architects and design and how the district responded to needs. He noted the integrity of the 1907, 1914, and 1931, and said loss of the parapets was troubling, but the strength of all buildings outweighs integrity issues. He said the building is also important to the community of Wallingford. He said the stairs and stair enclosures, interior of boys' gym should be included.

Mr. Sneddon agreed the gym should be included. He said he wanted to see the sawtooth portion and how the light was used.

Mr. Luoma said he would like to have seen NBBJ respond more to existing buildings than they did and said the 1958 portion is an odd juxtaposition.

Ms. Barker supported nomination of the 1907, 1914, and 1931 portions, the original Batchelder water fountain, boys' gym, stair, exteriors of all buildings.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of Lincoln High School at 4400 Interlake Avenue North for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site; the exteriors of the all buildings; and the interior stair and stair enclosures of the 1907, 1914 and 1931 buildings; 1914 boys' gym; original water fountain; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for February 17, 2016; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

010616.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

010616.51 Mount Baker Presbyterian Church
3201 Hunter Boulevard South

Ms. Doherty explained the signed agreement. She read through the agreement and noted that liturgical elements are not included.

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

010616.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator