



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 217/18

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, April 18, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Russell Coney
Garrett Hodgins
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Nicole McKernan
Julianne Patterson

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Kathleen Durham
Steven Treffers

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

- 041818.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
March 7, 2018 and March 21, 2018 Deferred.
- 041818.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**
- 041818.21 Shafer Building
515 Pine Street
Proposed storefront revisions

Ms. Sodt explained the revision to previous design. She said they are flipping where the entry doors will be; there will be no impact to the terracotta pilasters.

Mr. Kiel said that ARC had no comment and noted there was no impact to historic fabric.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations at Shafer Building, 515 Pine Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 113430 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/RC/JP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

041818.22

Bon Marche/Macy's
300 Pine Street
Proposed vinyl window film signage

Ms. Sodt provided material sample and said signage will be vinyl applied to two doors that go to offices upstairs; color is 'Blue Shift'. She said that ARC has reviewed.

Mr. Kiel said ARC reviewed and agreed there were no impacts to the building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed window film signage at the Bon Marche/Macy's Building, 300 Pine Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 114772 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/RC/JP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

041818.23

Hamilton Middle School

1610 North 41st Street

Retroactive proposal to build parapet atop canopy, and proposal for other security measures at building exterior

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Ms. Barker said that ARC had a briefing on this project.

Ms. Doherty said a contemporary building addition had been built on the northeast portion of the site and it was approved by the board. She said the School District has cited many challenges with security and vandalism. The school facility's staff built this structure on top of the canopy to try and prevent future access by vandals.

Frank Griffin, Seattle Public Schools, explained that the barrier was built on the breezeway canopy to keep kids from climbing up to access the roof. He said they proposed to remove the corrugated metal cladding and install architectural metal panels that match the existing gym building beyond. On the back of the building they want to install rollers which he said are an effective way to keep kids off the roof. He said to the right of the vestibule they will install a ladder guard to prevent climbing higher. He said work will be on the 2007-10 building only with no impact to the historic building. He said the canopy is where kids wait for busses and is needed for rain protection. He said on the opposite side the wall has an electrical meter, fire alarm box, and people climb up the wall and the sunscreen; they want to add beveled strips on the face of storefront to eliminate finger grips, the rest will have rollers. He said there has been graffiti and breaking of the skylight. He said kids are swinging off the building's historic ornamental elements.

Ms. Barker asked for clarification in changes in materials packet.

Mr. Griffin said the window clip makes it difficult to climb the windows.

Ms. Patterson asked for clarification on flat metal that replaced the corrugated metal.

Mr. Griffin provided a material sample.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Coney said ARC discussed and agreed that, for now, it is a reasonable solution in light of what they are facing.

Ms. Johnson agreed and said the metal matches the building, and it is a reasonable option.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the retroactive application for the proposed exterior alterations at Hamilton Middle School, 1610 North 41st Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 274/06) as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.
2. The applicant has demonstrated the necessity to add these features to the existing building addition for security purposes.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/GH/JP 6:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

041818.24 Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District - Building 30
6327 NE 74th Street
Proposed select window replacement

Ms. Doherty explained that in 2012 wood sash windows were replaced with aluminum clad windows in art lofts along southwest side. She said that Earth Corps occupies the northeast corner tenant space; there are no original wood windows left in this area. She said the elevations help depict proposed changes. Anderson windows installed in the 1980s are outlined in red. She noted page A.32 and said red lines showing proportion of 1/1 windows; SPARC decided they wanted cross rails to line up. She said the existing windows do not have divided lites. It appears from the historic drawings that the original windows had divided lites..

Ms. Barker asked about the east façade.

Jessica Bradley, Craft Architects, said the rest of the building wood windows were already replaced.

Ms. Doherty said SPARC members noted that the proposed brick mold profile was consistent with the original era.

Mr. Kiel said the rest are similar.

Ms. Patterson asked about the existing bay window replacement.

Ms. Bradley said this is a steel frame and sash, and they propose to replace with an aluminum system. They will closely mimic what is there.

Ms. Patterson asked if they will be operable.

Ms. Bradley said they won't be operable. That made the sash/frame much bulkier in appearance.

Ms. Barker noted it is the only bay window on the building and it tilted to face the former airfield runway.

Ms. Doherty said SPARC reviewed use of the proposed window film.

Ms. Bradley said a portion of the Earth Corps office crosses into the hangar windows; they propose to apply film there to try and improve thermal performance. She noted the film is removable.

Mr. Coney asked if interior storm windows had been explored; he said it is a simple solution that might be better.

Ms. Doherty said SPARC felt the overall proposal was reasonable; the committee's concern with the film was to make sure it is not awkward in appearance and to make sure it is removable. She said on the north side, the last bay to the west, is not part of Earth Corps' space, but it would be nice if they were replaced. She said it could be done as administrative approval in the future if the Board agreed. She said it is not occupiable space and is where the pocket doors reside when in the open position. She said the Board received a letter of support from the Friends of Sand Point Magnuson Park Historic District.

Ms. McKernan wondered about precedent and noted the different types of windows on one elevation.

Ms. Patterson noted a third window type was being introduced.

Mr. Kiel said the bay window material was not character-defining.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Doherty said that SPARC thought the proposed replacement of the steel bay window was reasonable here.

Mr. Coney said mimicking what was there makes the whole building consistent.

Ms. Barker said the windows in front of the hangar door pockets should receive administrative review when proposed to be replaced.

Ms. Patterson noted irony of taking operable window and making it inoperable.

Woman said they could stay with operable aluminum, but it would look very different.

Ms. Patterson said she didn't love it but it would be acceptable as proposed.

Mr. Coney said that future window replacement in the area designated for administrative review needs to be an exact match for the currently proposed make and model of window.

Board members concurred.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior building alterations at Building 30, 6327 NE 47th Street. The group of windows on the north façade that are currently not included in the

scope of work can be reviewed administratively in the future, if proposed to exactly match the adjacent replacement windows.

The proposal as presented does not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 124850, and complies with the Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation, and Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District Design Guidelines as follows:

Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation

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 will 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.

Relevant District Guidelines for:

BUILDINGS & STRUCTURES

Windows

- Retaining, preserving and in some cases restoring the original historic fenestration pattern (window placement pattern) should be a priority.
- An in-depth survey identifying the condition of the existing window frames and sash should be undertaken prior to any consideration of projects involving the replacement or alteration of window sash or window units.
- Multi-pane steel window sash and frames should be repaired by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing deteriorated features or components. Such repair may include the in-kind replacement of those parts that are missing or extensively deteriorated. Consideration may be given to the use of substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility and visual impacts. (Consideration for substitute materials will only be given when it can be documented that all options for repair or replacement in-kind have been exhausted and said substitute material is the only remaining feasible option. A life-cycle assessment and life-cycle cost analysis should be carried out to prove the technical and economic feasibility of selecting a substitute material verses repair or replacement in-kind. Important factors to consider include embodied energy, raw material extraction, manufacturing processes, initial cost, future replacement cost, repairs, and maintenance.)
- Wooden window sash, frames and trim should be repaired by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing deteriorated features or components. Such repair may include the in-kind replacement of those parts that are missing or extensively deteriorated. Consideration may be given to the use of substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility and visual impacts.
- Replacement of historic sash and frame members may be undertaken if it can be demonstrated that the window is too deteriorated to repair and all possible repair and upgrading options have been explored. Replacement sash, pane configuration and frame members should closely match the size and design of the historic sash and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute

materials based on technical and economic feasibility as long as the essential design and character of the window is replicated.

- In order to comply with current energy code requirements every effort should be made to develop design solutions that do not radically change, obscure or alter primary elevations, character-defining features or materials especially fenestration patterns and intact historic window units. Code compliant replacement sash, pane configuration and frame members should closely match the size, configuration and design of the historic sash and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility as long as the essential design and character of the window is replicated.
- Restoration of an entire missing original window or replacement of an existing non-historic window may be undertaken. Replacement sash, pane configuration and frame members should be based on available historical, pictorial or physical documentation, and should closely match the size and design of the original historic sash and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility assessment (including life-cycle cost analysis) as long as the essential design and character of the original window type is replicated.

Corrugated and/or Flat Metal panels

- Every effort should be made to repair metal cladding features by patching, splicing, or otherwise reinforcing the metal using methods recommended by the NPS.
- If required, all replacement metal cladding and features should be an in-kind match that will not alter the essential form and detailing of the historic cladding. Consideration may be given to the use of substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility and visual impacts.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

041818.25

Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District - Building 20

7777 62nd Avenue NE

Proposed exterior building alterations and new outdoor seating
Platform and freestanding canopy

Henry Walters, Atelier Drome, provided context of the site and went through the drawing packet. He proposed addition of 2,500 square foot deck with ADA accessibility. He said two windows will be replaced with roll up garage doors. They will cover over existing non-ADA ramp and modify historic sliding door to meet Code for door swing. He noted existing condition of paved parking. He explained the deck will be open to public and will provide outdoor seating area for proposed café and brewery. He said the deck will have steel frame, light gauge metals; everything will sit on grade beams so there will be no excavation. He said the deck was engineered by Swenson Say Faget.

He went through proposed materials – weathered steel, roman shade awning, ipe wood for deck and stair surfaces, fiber cement board, reclaimed wine barrel planters. He said the deck is sensitive to the scale and material of adjacent decks. He said a

few inches of the central door panel must be removed and an offset pivot will be used; it will match existing hardware.

Ms. Barker asked how the staircase to the south will function.

Mr. Walters said there will be a small separation; the deck is open to everyone. He said a second means of egress is required.

Mr. Coney asked about the building sign.

Mr. Walters said they will raise the Bldg 20 sign up.

Ms. Doherty said SPARC talked about sign placement and wanted it in the center, so it was just scooted up to make room for the proposed business sign.

Mr. Walters said they will fasten into the mortar joints.

Mr. Kiel asked if they will put a glass top on the canopy.

Mr. Walters said they will use the sun shade; it is just to extend summer outdoor seating a bit longer.

Mr. Kiel said he thought it will look bad in a short period of time.

Ms. Patterson asked about fiber cement attachment.

Mr. Walters said it is not attached to the building – only to the steel framing of the deck. Responding to clarifying questions, he reiterated that the deck is stand-alone and was approved by a structural engineer.

Ms. Patterson was concerned about cutting out the window sills and brick knee walls for the new overhead doors.

Mr. Walters said the existing sills are 5' high preventing most everyone from seeing outside. This is also the opportunity to bring more light in.

Ms. Patterson asked if it is an original masonry opening.

Ms. Doherty said it is.

Ms. Johnson asked if the Cascade Bicycle Club space used original masonry openings.

Ms. Doherty said it was a mix and that some were enlarged to add doors.

Ms. Barker asked if CorTen steel had been used elsewhere in the district.

Kevin Bergsrud, DOPAR, said it is at Building 67.

Mr. Hodgins asked what is driving the proportions of the overhead door fenestration.

Mr. Walters said they liked the proportion; they broke at 9' mark because of the crane rail at the ceiling inside. He said it is a mix of height and width proportions at other windows.

Mr. Hodgins said it feels busy.

Mr. Bergsrud said this building (11/20) was built in five phases; there are lots of different types of windows and doors.

Responding to questions Mr. Walters said that they took the opportunity to have the three doors aligned; the sliding door will be approximately where the windows sit and is aligned with the forward edge of the steel lintel.

Ms. McKernan asked what drove the height of the new canopy.

Mr. Walters said it is just above the height of the original window. He said the roman shade fabric will sit in front of the fixed transom but won't block view. He said the sail cloth will need regular maintenance or will be removed during winter.

Ms. Doherty said all five SPARC members supported the proposal; they found the material palette and scale compatible (details in the Staff Report recommendation). The work is easily reversible, the torpedo ramp – a character defining feature – is maintained. She said that one member lamented changes to window openings but noted the importance of adaptive reuse. All were in agreement that signage should move higher up and be centered on the door because they thought that Building 20's symmetry was important. She said she received public comment letter of support that was shared with the Board.

Mr. Coney asked about landscaping.

Shannon Wing, Atelier Drome, said native landscaping is preferred.

Public Comment:

Letter of support received by staff.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Patterson appreciated the aesthetic and amenity and said they design team did a great job. She said it is stand-alone and is reversible. She expressed concern about replacement of windows with overhead doors and cutting into the brick to accommodate that. She didn't like it being done at Cascade but it serves as access for bikes; here it is just for light. She said it changes the look of the building too much.

Mr. Kiel said it is more about vision in and out.

Mr. Hodgins agreed and said the overhead doors will dramatically change the front of the building – it is a luxury rather than a necessity.

Ms. Patterson said the windows were originally placed high for a reason.

Ms. Barker said there are ways to get lighting inside like skylighting.

Ms. Johnson agreed that it changes the building but thinks it might be okay. She would defer to the local committee.

Mr. Kiel said the industrial character allows some flexibility with changes.

Board members agreed that an intervention on one side only was more appropriate and the window on the right (north of the entry) should remain in place.

Ms. Patterson said original fenestration is a priority and was put in the guidelines for a reason. She said it is a risk to think that it is 'just a warehouse we can do whatever'. She said the guidelines state "exterior additions or alterations should not radically change, obscure or destroy primary elevations, character-defining features, materials or finishes."

Ms. Barker said the original building was set up for different purposes – storage of torpedoes – and high windows were character-defining features of that use.

Ms. Doherty said there was strong support from SPARC and the Friends group for the proposal.

Board members took a straw poll about changing the windows to overhead doors. One board member deferred to SPARC recommendation; others were supportive of alteration of one window only and to have as light a touch as possible.

Ms. McKernan thought the horizontal divided lights in the roll up door is jarring and that historically the divided lights were square or vertical in nature.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior building alterations and site improvements at Buildings 20, 7777 62nd Avenue NE. The north opening will maintain original window; proposed overhead door acceptable on south side; existing entry as close to original location (plane) as possible.

The proposal as presented does not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 124850, and takes into consideration the Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation, and Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District Design Guidelines as follows:

Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation

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 will 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.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Relevant District Guidelines for:

BUILDINGS & STRUCTURES

Windows

- Retaining, preserving and in some cases restoring the original historic fenestration pattern (window placement pattern) should be a priority.

Entrances & Porches

- Retaining, preserving and in some cases reestablishing original or historic entrances, entry doors and porches should be a priority.

Architectural Features & Details

- Retaining, preserving and restoring original architectural and decorative features including historic signage and building identification numbers, building ornament and functional elements and historic light fixtures should be of the highest priority.

Existing Non-Historic Additions/Alterations

- Consideration may be given to the removal of non-historic additions or alterations based on available historical, pictorial or physical documentation.
- Consideration may be given to the alteration of non-historic additions or prior alterations based on available historical, pictorial or physical documentation.
- Any new construction (other than reconstruction) associated with the removal or alteration of non-historic elements should be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible with the adjacent historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion of the building.

New Additions/Exterior Alterations

- Additions or alterations may be necessary or desired in order to adapt a building to a new or an expanded use.
- Such alterations should be considered only after full evaluation has been given to adapting functional changes within the existing interior spaces.
- Exterior additions or alterations should not radically change, obscure or destroy primary elevations, character-defining features, materials or finishes.
- New construction should be clearly differentiated from the historic building such that a false sense of historic appearance is not created *and* should not diminish the historic property or its character-defining features.
- Design for new construction may be contemporary in character or may directly reference design motifs or proportions drawn from the historic building.
- Design of new construction should be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationships of solids and voids, and color.
- Any new building addition should be constructed in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic building will be intact.
- New windows may be installed and new window openings on a rear or secondary elevation in order to accommodate a new or expanded use. Window size and proportion should be compatible with the overall design and character of the building but it should not duplicate historic features or create a false historic appearance.

Accessibility

- Every effort should be made to comply with barrier-free accessibility requirements with design solutions that do not radically change, obscure or alter primary elevations, character-defining features or materials.
- If it is technically infeasible to meet accessibility code requirements and adhere to the above guideline, alternative design solutions are allowed by code.
- The design of new or additional means of access should be compatible with the design of the individual historic building and its building site.
- New ramps, guardrails and handrails should be clearly differentiated from the historic building such that character-defining features are not diminished or a false historic appearance created. However, it is important that new work be designed with characteristics sympathetic to the historic building and be based on the established palette of design elements and construction materials.

BUILDING SITES & DISTRICT SETTING

New Landscape or Site Features

- New landscape features or site features should not radically change, obscure or destroy primary elevations, character-defining features, nearby materials or finishes.
- New site features should be clearly differentiated from historic site features such that character-defining features are not diminished or a false historic appearance created. All new site work should be designed in character with the historic building and be based on established design elements and materials.
- New plant materials should be selected from the established *Sand Point Annotated Historic Plant List* (Vegetation Management Plan, 2001) provided by Parks.
- New plant materials should be similar in mass to existing or historic plantings on the building site.

New Street Furniture

- The introduction and design of new fixed street furniture (including benches, trash receptacles, mailboxes, drinking fountains, bike racks, picnic tables, bollards, and handrails and guardrails) should follow established site furnishing precedents.
- New street furniture should be simple and utilitarian in character and should not create a false sense of historical development.
- Natural wood, galvanized or anodized aluminum, dark-painted steel products, and stainless-steel materials are recommended.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/GH/KJ 4:3:0 Motion carried. Mmes. Patterson, McKernan, and Barker opposed.

041818.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

041818.31 Sheridan Apartments
2011 Fifth Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained that a briefing packet would be coming in the next month; a four-month extension was requested. She believes the owners are listening to ARC feedback.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Sheridan Apartments, 2011 Fifth Avenue, for four months.

MM/SC/RC/JP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

041818.32 Griffin Building
2005 Fifth Avenue
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Griffin Building, 2005 Fifth Avenue, for four months.

MM/SC/RC/JP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

041818.33 Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena
305 Harrison Street
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena, 305 Harrison Street, one month.

MM/SC/RC/JP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

041818.34 Bressi Garage
226-232 1st Avenue North
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Bressi Garage, 226-232 1st Avenue North, for one month.

MM/SC/RC/JP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

041818.4 DESIGNATION

041818.41 University of Washington Canoe House / ASUW Shell House
(former US Naval Training Hangar)
365 Walla Walla Road NE

Mike McCormack, University of Washington, thanked the board.

Ms. Barker advised she would leave at 6:00 pm.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, said she did additional research on the Montlake Cut history, Naval Military Base history, Dan Brown's book, "Boys in the Boat", and books on George Pocock, Al Ulbrickson, L. E. Gregory. She said she read a historic booklet

about the U. S. Naval Training camp that was set up to temporarily house 300 and it grew to 5,000.

She provided context of the site and went over campus plans from 1915 and 1948 which envisioned the area along with recreation facilities. She said that crewing / rowing was a fashionable, popular sport. She noted the association of the site with water and early airplanes; the water was an airfield and the hangar had large doors with ramping for airplanes. She said the U. S. Naval Training station took up a wide swath of the south end of the campus. She said that many buildings were there. She noted early Boeing support of activities in the building.

Ms. Boyle researched comparable military hangars and found all kinds of forms – tents, divisibles in San Antonio, Pensacola, but nothing of this age in Bremerton. She said the form has large windows, outrigger to allow wide door opening. She said that women's intramural rowing came and went. She said great numbers of people attended races; she noted the 'can do' attitude of the young people. She said the style of rowing was brought as much by Pocock who also designed a new type of boat. She said the properties of red cedar and the way the boat was built helped advance the local team.

She said that a 20' loft and loft apartment were added; Pocock occupied both. She said that Pocock and his son started looking for a new location in and moved out in 1963.

Ms. Barker left at 6:00 pm.

Ms. Boyle said that by 1964 rowing and crew had left the building. In 1976 the apartment and shed addition were removed. She noted the canted perimeter walls and hangar-like mass on the north side. She said the wood windows and outriggers remain; doors have been set within the larger door. She noted the diagonal sheathing on doors. She said the shell house has become a place of pilgrimage for people. She said the crewists stroke together, move together, becoming one in physical motion.

She said the building meets several criteria for designation. She said it meets Criterion A, noting the establishment of aeronautics in the Northwest and the presence of the Naval Training facility. She said it meets Criterion B for its association with Pocock and Ulbrickson. She said there are multiple layers of association with cultural and economic heritage meeting Criteria C. She said the shell house meets Criterion D in that it is an intact vernacular structure that conveys its function, period and method of construction. She said it meets Criterion F. She said she did not know enough about the designer to meet Criterion E.

Mr. McCormack said they want to bring new life to the building through adaptive reuse. He supported Staff recommendation to include exterior and interior volume. He said to avoid temptation to pick up details.

Ms. Patterson asked for clarification on 'interior'.

Ms. Doherty said volume means 'the space' – the open space character and roof truss work; it doesn't include the stairs, walls, or interior partitions.

Mr. Coney asked if there was a notable moment for women's crew team.

Ms. Boyle said there were many. She said women used the building until they were assigned the west addition. She provided photos of the women's team in 1890s and 1925. She said there are periods when even intramural disappeared for women. She said that certain sports were considered appropriate for girls.

Mr. Hodgins said it is an easy decision and it was nice to learn more. He supported designation.

Ms. Patterson said it was a slam dunk and she supported designation; she said she agreed with the Staff Recommendation. She said the military history and aeronautic history were interesting and the Olympic win was huge.

Ms. McKernan said it was easy and that she supported designation; she said she would like to see more protected.

Mr. Coney supported designation. He said he appreciated the book and the 1936 win but said the Olympics didn't happen here. He agreed with the Staff Recommendation. He said he had never been here before the tour; he said Criterion F is a stretch. He said he likes the military history.

Mr. Hodgins responded that if Mr. Coney had ever gone by the building in a boat he would change his mind about Criterion F.

Ms. McKernan agreed. She said that criteria B, C, and F were relevant.

Ms. Johnson supported designation and agreed with the Staff Report. She noted rowing's association as an elite sport and how this building embodies the West Coast version of that. She said it is a great story and a beautiful building built for what it was; the structure supports that.

Mr. Kiel agreed. He supported designation.

Ms. Patterson thanked the UW for bring the nomination to the board.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the University of Washington Canoe House / ASUW Shell House / US Naval Training Hangar at 3655 Walla Walla Road NE as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards A,B, C, D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building; the interior building volume and roof truss work; and a portion of the site around the building perimeter measured twenty feet out from base of the building.

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

041818.5

STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator