



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 275/19

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday May 15, 2019 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Russell Coney
Kathleen Durham
Rich Freitas
Alan Guo
Garrett Hodgins
Kristen Johnson

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Genna Nashem
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Manish Chalana
Jordon Kiel

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

051519.1 MEETING MINUTES

March 20, 2019

MM/SC/RC/RF 4:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Durham abstained.

Ms. Johnson and Mr. Guo arrived at 3:33pm

051519.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

051519.21 Harvard-Belmont Landmark District
1111 Bellevue Place E

Proposed addition and landscape alterations

Ms. Nashem explained the proposed alteration to a contributing building in the Harvard Belmont Landmark District including removing an existing non-original sun room and adding a two-story addition and new porch on the west side and new addition of an enlarged mudroom on the east side, install new wood windows in some locations and move existing windows in some locations, changes to the landscaping. She said the joint ARC April 26, 2019 Committee requested that the unfinished tree planting from a previous COA be included in this project. Revised landscaping plans are provided.

Applicant Comment:

Design team Ann Adams and John Adams explained the residential remodel and addition.

Ms. Adams said the house was built in 1906; most of the original detailing remains on the front and north sides. She said a later added sunroom at the southwest corner will be demolished. They propose to enlarge the main floor footprint. She said stairs to the basement will be added on the Boylston Street side; they will pull out a small volume and create a legal stair. She said they will extend over the existing footprint and add a second bathroom and a closet. She said the north part of the house is the most visible and will not be modified except the house will be painted. She noted substitution page A2.1 to relocate a leaded window from the back of the house. She went over landscape plans and noted one street tree was removed in 2016; no replacement tree has been planted because SPU main line is below. She said the tree replacement is added to this plan. She said they will plant two trees on Boylston.

Mr. Adams said two Carradia trees will be planted at 20' spacing; they will provide fall color. He said low height was needed because there are power lines above.

Ms. Adams provided an exterior materials palette and noted the upper portion of the house is stucco. She said there is beveled siding on the water table and the new addition. She said the lighter color will be used for trim, windows, eaves, brackets and corbels. She said the upper sash leading is applied to the exterior. All trim will be brushed, not sprayed for continuity. She said the roof is composite.

Mr. Coney asked about trees.

Mr. Adams said they will remove a Birch and he indicated on plan what remains.

Mr. Freitas asked the net new square footage.

Mr. Adams said 487 square feet.

Ms. Johnson said the stair bumps out close to the new window, the solarium was not original. She said there is no huge effect.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said ARC reviewed the application with Harvard Belmont review committee members.

Ms. Johnson said the reuse of the window and where they are putting it made sense.

Ms. Barker said the work is on non-primary façades.

Mr. Freitas said there is a mix of trees and asked what the primary character is.

Mr. Adams said deciduous trees dominate the site. He said there are not a lot of Evergreens at the corner; they are limited there because of the wires. He said when the trees turn color, they are showy and provide nice accent.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval at 1111 Bellevue Place E for additions and landscape alterations per the submittal.

This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes are addressed on the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

I. STATEMENT OF INTENT AND PURPOSE

Purpose and Goals

The purpose and goals of the Harvard-Belmont District are:

- A. To preserve, protect, enhance, and perpetuate those elements of the District's cultural, social, economic, architectural, and historic heritage;
- B. To foster community and civic pride in the significance and accomplishments of the past;
- C. To stabilize or improve the historic authenticity, economic vitality, and aesthetic value of the district;
- D. To promote and encourage continued private ownership and use of buildings and other structures;

Guidelines

B. Setting

1. General

The height of new buildings and additions should be similar to the heights of adjacent properties so that the relationship of building heights and the land contour remains the same.

2. The Block

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

Maintain the pattern of primary building entrances facing the street. Renovations should preserve the original building entrances facing the street.

C. Individual Buildings

1. Addition or Renovations:

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

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

3. Landscaping:

- Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.
- Maintain the alignment and spacing of street trees. Planting street trees where none now exist is encouraged.
- Maintain a clear separation between sidewalk and street and between sidewalk and site.
- Keep the space between sidewalk and street as a green planting space maintaining the same width wherever possible. Ground covers may be used in place of grass. Do not use crushed rock, concrete or similar materials as the major surface material.

Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation

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

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

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

051519.22

Leamington-Pacific Apartments
317 Marion Street
Proposed window replacement

Bo Scarim, Plymouth Housing, explained they house the chronically homeless. She proposed replacement of all windows; the interior courtyard and alley have been replaced but the rest are in bad condition. She said replacement will be like for like – wood on primary façades. She said on courtyard and alley, aluminum-clad like for like were installed.

Paul Wood, Cherry Creek Windows, said the wood is designed to look as close to original as possible. He said there are solid sills, divided lites to get ¾” dimension.

Isel Tamayo, McLeod Construction, said the two buildings are fused together. The building facing west has one profile and they will have casing milled to match. He said they used a Marvin product on the alley and courtyard which have a standard profile and are compatible in appearance.

Mr. Wood said they are using Marvin for the best appearance and match. He said instead of ropes, hidden block and tackle system, the system uses a spring that is calculated per weight. He said they will use the same paint color, wood will match existing, and cladding will be very close.

Ms. Durham asked if the sill will match on the front.

Mr. Tamayo said the sill will remain the same. The sub sill attachment will sit on the brick; the existing metal windows have it already on alley and courtyard. He said it is a solid sill on the window that comes straight down to the brick. Windows are tested to meet energy codes; windows are single hung.

Ms. Scarim said that timing is of the essence; they tried to do the work in 2013 but didn't have the funds. She said they have funding now.

Mr. Hodgins asked about cost comparison of repair versus new.

Mr. Tamayo said the labor is a three-to-one and there is impact to building tenants to consider. He said they can remove the windows, waterproof, and install a new unit in one day, for minimal disruption to the occupants. He said it is about \$4,000 per window to restore them, versus \$1,500 on average per smaller window to replace.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Johnson said the ARC talked about installation and filling in pockets where the ropes were. She said it is a worthwhile project and she is happy they have the funding. She said they are matching profiles and what is proposed is reasonable.

Mr. Freitas had no comment.

Ms. Barker said it is a terrific building.

Ms. Johnson said that some windows are fixed and will be replaced in-kind.

Ms. Sodt said they did shop drawings of every window and did a good job of documenting.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at the Leamington-Pacific Apartments, 317 Marion Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed replacement of the original windows affects the features of the landmark, but the applicant has demonstrated the need for replacement due to the condition of the windows (see the window survey); the existing primary elevation single-glazed wood windows will be replaced with double-glazed wood windows, therefore the new windows will match the old in design, color, and materials, per Standard #6 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*

2. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #117398, as the proposed alterations are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

Mr. Coney said he wasn't a fan of replacing original windows but that in this case he deferred to the benefits.

051519.23 former U.S. Marine Hospital / Pacific Hospital
 1200 12th Avenue South
 Proposed removal of a tree

Tabled.

051519.24 former John B. Allen School / Phinney Neighborhood Association
 6532 Phinney Avenue North
 Site improvements and landscaping/play space

Scott Boetjer, Johnson Sutherland, explained improvements will activate the south side of the blue building. He provided orientation to the site and indicated the project area. He said the property line cuts through the mulched area where the improvements are planned. He proposed a concrete block garden bed surrounded by asphalt. He said the project will invite public use of the space. He noted the introduction of natural materials and rubberized step stones. He said concrete will be used for ADA ramp and landing into the area. He proposed replacement of asphalt paving with mulch to entrance of the garden environment. He described art pieces to be installed. A shed will shift to the Phinney property side. He said fencing will screen HVAC units. He provided before and after renderings. He said the fence is chain link, matching what else is on site. He said the screen attached to the concrete pad and not to the building. He provided paint samples.

Ms. Durham asked about the "no-trip" base.

Mr. Boetger said in anticipation of ADA cane-detection, when they removed the asphalt, they had to show asphalt edge. He said the width of the aluminum is 1/4".

Ms. Durham asked if they are concerned kids will fall on it.

Mr. Boetger said the artist called it a no-trip base. He said they could revise it.

Mr. Freitas said the exposed asphalt edge is only where the art piece is going.

Mr. Boetger concurred and said there will be small rocks there.

Mr. Coney asked how much mulch is planned and if they are waterproofing the base of the building.

Mr. Boetger said they will remove the asphalt and will put the mulch on the sub base. He said they are still getting to the details.

Mr. Coney said he worried about the stairwell and large openings.

Lee Harper, PNA, said it is a co-op; there are children running around now with parents there.

Mr. Freitas asked if asphalt would be resurfaced or sealed.

Mr. Boetger they will patch but will not re-do it. He said it will be patched, cleaned, and painted.

Mr. Freitas asked about wood chips as they relate to the ADA ramps.

Mr. Boetger said they playground surfacing is designed to be compacting that allows for wheelchair on the other side of the play area. He said it is not intended to be fully accessible or full universal design.

Mr. Guo asked about the part in the existing right-of-way.

Ms. Harper said the whole site is accessible except for four hours a day when the kids are out there.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Freitas said that ARC thought the proposal was reasonable. He said it is well-used space and is used as a neighborhood cut through. He said it is activated by the pre-school.

Mr. Coney asked if lighting was included and if there are issues with camping.

Mr. Boetger said lighting is not planned.

Ms. Harper said there is very little problem with camping.

Mr. Boetger hoped this would add more activation.

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

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #123845, as the proposed site alterations are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features 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/GH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

051519.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

051519.31 Bricklayers Building
318 Fairview Avenue North

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a three-month extension. Responding to clarifying questions she said the building is owned by the City and is part of the Streetcar project.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Bricklayers Building, 318 Fairview Avenue North, for three months.

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

051519.4 TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

051519.41 Eitel Building
1501 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained that the Board is requested to verify the eligibility of the Eitel Building at 1501 Second Avenue for the transfer of development rights (TDR); the Board is also requested to approve the required covenant. The code provisions require:

- Designation of the building(s) as a City of Seattle Landmark, pursuant to SMC 25.12;
- Execution of a Controls and Incentive Agreement regarding the Landmark and recording of same against the property;
- Receipt of a TDR authorization letter from SDCI, which establishes the amount of TDRs available for transfer from the sending site;
- Provisions of security to assure completion of any required rehabilitation and restoration of the landmark, unless such work has been completed.
- The owner must also execute and record an agreement in the form and content acceptable to the Landmarks Preservation Board providing for the maintenance of the historically significant features of the building, per SMC 23.49.014D(4). The owner has completed, and the City Historic Preservation Officer has approved, subject to final approval by the Board, a covenant that includes the commitment of the owner to maintain the Eitel Building consistent with Ordinance No. 123534.

The board received a copy of the covenant and its attachments, which includes the SDCI TDR authorization letter.

Ms. Sodt said it will help pay for the renovation costs. The TDR will be used downtown and is enough for a floorplate for someone. She said the Leamington is using the profits from TDR sales to do their windows. Responding to board questions she said the sale is a private real estate transaction.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board makes the determination that the Eitel Building at 1501 Second Avenue has fulfilled the requirements for transfer of Landmark TDR pursuant to SMC 23.49.014 and Ordinance No. 120443 – that the building is a designated Landmark with a Controls and Incentives Agreement pursuant to Ordinance No. 123534; that an authorization letter from SDCI has been received and has identified the number of transferable square feet to be 21,408 square feet; and, the building is not presently in need of rehabilitation, therefore no security is required.

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

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approved the agreement entitled “COVENANTS FOR LANDMARK TRANSFERABLE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS” as submitted to the Board as the legal agreement required as a condition to the transfer of development rights from the Eitel Building at 1501 Second Avenue, per SMC 23.49.014D(4).”

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

051519.5 NOMINATIONS

051519.51 University of Washington Eagleson Hall
1417 NE 42nd Street

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

Mr. Howard provided context of the campus and said the building was constructed in 1923 as YMCA use; it was built to the parcel lines on the east, west, and south sides. He said there is an 8’ setback on the north. He said the north and east are the primary facades; there is an alley on the west. The two-and-a-half story cross-gable-roof building features a rectangular 103-by-80-foot plan; this measurement extends to the building’s outermost extent to include the north bay window.

The rooflines correspond to the interior layout, with tall, steeply pitched gable roofs rising above the north and east facades and a series of flat roofs with low parapets over the southwest portion and added mechanical spaces. The load bearing, unreinforced masonry building features cast stone detailing at the building’s sills, quoins, roofline, chimneys, entrance railing, and entrance surrounds. Brick color varies from brick to brick, ranging from buff to tan. Leaded lite, wood sash casement windows in paired and triple groupings are the dominant window type on the primary

facades. A prominent two-story bay window with a crenelated roof projects from the east end of the north facade. The main front entrance is centrally located on the north facade with a second public entrance on the east side of the building. Both are located below prominent gable roofed wall dormers and have cast stone surrounds.

The building interior features several floor levels that are offset from one another resulting in a complex interior arrangement. He said the auditorium has been subdivided into classrooms. The north two-thirds of the original main lounge has offices now in the former south third. The story-and-a-half main lounge volume retains a wood panel and batten wainscot with top rail. Plaster wall finishes extend above to the horizontal tongue and groove V-joint board soffit between the trusses. The trusses span east to west and consist of a pointed arched stained wood bottom chord with a boxed member king post and upper and lower collar ties. Steel rods added in 1947 span between the ends of the bottom chord. Multiple large leaded lite windows along the east side and the main bay window on the north provide day lighting. A massive plaster clad fireplace with a cast stone mantel is located along the east wall. A similar fireplace remains at the south end of the wing within an office created from the former open volume social area. Alterations added an acoustical panel ceiling that runs below the trusses.

Ms. Pratt reported that Eagleson Hall was constructed during Seattle's 1920s construction boom. The neighborhood thrived during this period and, by the end of the 1920s, showcased a vibrant commercial core along University Way NE (14th Avenue NE) with numerous large apartment buildings all surrounded by a well-established single-family neighborhood. The area has been home to the Suquamish and Duwamish people for thousands of years prior to European contact and has a rich history that predates the current built environment. Trails once traversed the area, connecting village sites to burn areas and waterways. In 1867 Christian and Harriet Brownfield, the first Euro-American settlers to homestead in the University District area, filed a claim for 174 acres of property. Transportation improvements during the 1880s increased the area's desirability for development.

She said the first building on campus, the Administration Building (now Denny Hall) was completed in 1895 and classes began on September 4, 1895. Platting of the neighborhood continued during this time and nearly the entire University District was platted by 1910. The "University" moniker for the neighborhood became official when the University Station post office was established in 1902. Hotels and commercial structures were constructed in anticipation of the 1909 Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, hosted on the University of Washington campus. The university hired local architect and the founder of the university's new architecture department Carl F. Gould to design a new plan to guide development on campus. The Regents Plan, as it was known, established Collegiate Gothic as the primary architectural style for new campus construction, a trend which persisted into the 1950s.

Ms. Pratt said the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) was founded in London, England, by a 22-year old George Williams with 11 friends. The young men gathered together for Bible Study and prayer. Thomas Valentine Sullivan brought the organization to the United States, establishing the first U.S. YMCA at the Old South Church in Boston in 1851. The first student YMCA was formed in 1856 at Cumberland University in Lebanon, Tennessee. The YMCA was first organized in Seattle in 1876 by 15 men with Dexter Horton serving as the organization's first

president. At the time of the YMCA's establishment in Seattle, the organization was still very much invested in the spiritual and religious lives of its members. Bible classes were an important part of Seattle's early YMCA, but it soon became a community place for newcomers to Seattle hosting a library, lectures, and socials along with the more religiously minded programs. The organization opened its first gymnasium in 1886, expanding its programming to begin to reflect the mission and values more readily associated with the organization today. Their recreational facilities expanded to include a bathing beach and bathhouse and a field.

She said the YMCA's non-religious programs attracted the most attendance early on and the young organization struggled to find space to accommodate everyone, moving 11 times between 1876 and 1890. In 1887, they began a campaign to construct their own building. Their new building at 1423 Front Street was completed in 1890, although only 2 stories versus the planned 4 stories due to construction costs following the Great Fire of 1899. The new building featured impressive recreational facilities with rowing machines and an indoor track. The YMCA's board of directors soon revised their Articles of Incorporation to reflect the shift in the organization's mission and goals to foster the mental, social, and physical well-being of members in addition to the spiritual.

Ms. Pratt said that during this time, the University of Washington YMCA (University YMCA) was formed in 1888 by George Carter, the general secretary of the Seattle YMCA. However, the branch was founded separately from the central organization as part of a national student YMCA movement. While the University YMCA was growing on campus, the Seattle YMCA was also expanding in downtown Seattle. Financial campaigns to construct a University District branch began in 1919. The University of Washington branch of the YMCA was first established in 1888 by George Carter, general secretary of the Seattle YMCA. The impetus for establishing an off-campus home for the University YMCA resulted from a new interpretation of the Washington State Constitution which prohibited religious organizations from use of campus facilities. Organizers sought to erect the new building adjacent to campus to serve as "student headquarters for the voluntary spiritual and religious culture and service at the University." Initially the University YMCA had much grander plans for their new building, launching a \$250,000 building campaign, but soon scaled back to a \$100,000 campaign. In November 1920, the University YMCA purchased property for their new building, lots 1 and 2 of block 12 in the Brooklyn Addition, for \$9,311.50.

She said in early 1922, the University YMCA's board of trustees selected Carl F. Gould, professor with the university's architecture department and partner in Bebb & Gould, as the architect for their new building. Gould traveled to New York City to consult with the International Young Men's Christian Association Building Bureau and was able to review plans of all the YMCA buildings around the world to ensure his design would be in harmony with the organization's other buildings.

The Board of Trustees also determined to construct the building in memorial to James M. "Jimmy" Eagleson, a former University of Washington student and active University YMCA worker who died during World War I. James was born and raised in Seattle. He entered the University of Washington in 1912 and graduated in 1917. During his years at the university, he was a devoted leader at the University YMCA, served as yell king at sporting events for a term, and a member of Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity. He married his college sweetheart, Mary Geneva Sims, on November 24, 1917. James then attended Officers' Training School at the Presidio, graduating with

a commission of second lieutenant. His unit, the 69th Artillery at Fort Casey, was sent abroad to serve in World War I in July 1918. Shortly after Eagleson was sent overseas, his wife gave birth to their son James Sims Eagleson. Eagleson and his unit returned from France in 1919, but en route he contracted influenza. He died of pneumonia on February 19, 1919, shortly after arriving in the U.S. at Newport News, Virginia.

The official groundbreaking ceremony occurred on June 19, 1922 with Eagleson's 4-year old son, James, moving the first shovel full of dirt at the groundbreaking. Construction began on June 28th and Murdock and Eckman were selected as the contractors. Construction continued through the summer and into the fall. The building was opened to the public for the first time in March 1923. Once its new building was completed, the University YMCA moved into Eagleson Hall where it remained until 1963. The building was designed to provide for the spiritual, social, and athletic needs of its members. The main lounge provided space for community forums on public and world affairs, politics, science, and religion. Mixers were held on a quarterly basis.

Beginning in 1940, the local Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) shared Eagleson Hall with the University YMCA. The YWCA was founded in Seattle in 1894 and organized on the University of Washington campus in 1895. Like the YMCA, the YWCA had to leave the University of Washington campus after the prohibition of religious organizations from using campus facilities. The YWCA rented rooms in Eagleson beginning in 1940 and began to collaborate. In 1946, the two organizations established "Articles of Agreement on Cooperation" to create a partially unified budget to pool resources and share responsibilities. The two organizations operated jointly, even relocating together when Eagleson was sold to the UW, until 1970. The YWCA (UW) separated from the YMCA and relocated to 4224 University Way NE.

Originally focused on the spiritual and religious education of young male students, the University YMCA became more progressive and invested in social issues beginning in the 1930s. The University YMCA was even considered radical for its time, often hosting controversial speakers and speaking out on prominent issues. The University YMCA actively opposed the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II and came under sharp criticism for allowing students to rent a room to host communist leader Gus Hall.

Mr. Freitas asked when the YWCA was co-located with YMCA.

Ms. Pratt said they co-located until the 1970s.

Ms. Doherty said she suggested nomination of the site, exterior of the building, interior of the original entry lobby, main lounge, social room, writing room and connecting hallways and stair. She said it provided continuous and defined spaces and can be refined after a Board tour.

Ms. Pratt said it is a challenge to understand without a visit.

Mr. Freitas asked about the boundaries.

Ms. Doherty explained the legal description and said Lots 1 and 2 are where the building sits, the red footprint in the report. She said the south court and breezeway are later additions.

Mr. Howard said the roofing is clay tile and siding is asbestos siding.

Ms. Barker asked why there are multiple levels.

Ms. Pratt said that Gould was using a plan another architect had created for the YMCA to accommodate the auditorium.

Mr. Howard said the site slopes down to the south.

Ms. Barker asked about the different stairs.

Ms. Pratt said some were added when the auditorium level was added.

Mr. Howard said the perimeter space was converted to offices, classrooms. They ran the auditorium balcony floor plate out and subdivided the space.

Mr. Coney asked about the roof additions on the south side.

Mr. Howard said it was built out in the 1980s. He said there is still a u-shape roof top deck, but the auditorium skylight is gone. He said the auditorium has windows which allow daylighting.

Mr. Freitas asked if there are other Tudor Revival buildings off campus owned by the UW.

Ms. Blakeslee said she didn't think so.

Ms. Durham asked if there were other student organizations at the time of the YMCA or was it a unique niche.

Ms. Pratt said there were a lot of student organizations. The YMCA had a religious focus; the interpretation of State Constitution prohibited religious organizations from using the campus forced them off campus. She said the YMCA entertained a communist speaker after the UW had said no. She said that segregation was still occurring and members had to be Christian.

Ms. Johnson asked if there were other colleges/universities associated with a church. She said it doesn't seem unusual.

Ms. Pratt said that student organizations were not unusual nationwide. At the time there was only the downtown branch; in 1923 there were other branches. The University YMCA still exists but it is still off-campus and is not just for students.

Ms. Barker asked if the University district boundary was modified when they purchased this building.

Ms. Blakeslee said this boundary is specific to the major institutions zoning overlay.

Mr. Coney asked if the auditorium was a true gym.

Ms. Pratt said there are no historical photos, but they did intramural games, basketball.

Ms. Johnson asked if there was a ring of Tudor Revival buildings around the campus.

Ms. Pratt said there are a lot – houses, churches, and commercial buildings with Tudor detailing.

Public Comment:

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, supported nomination and said it is a great example of the style in the District. He said it is a beautiful example by Gould.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Coney said he was happy the building was brought forth. He said it was built to high standards. The rehab was nice, and it shows adaptive reuse. He supported nomination based on the staff recommendation. He requested a tour.

Mr. Hodgins said it is a great building that has stood the test of time. He said it is great in how it bridges Collegiate Gothic and Tudor Revival. He said the primary façade is intact. He said the main lounge is impressive. He supported nomination on the staff recommendation.

Mr. Guo supported nomination and said as a student the building is visible and that he had seen it many times a day. He said he wants to hear more about Japanese incarceration, and did the Y do anything to help when they came back.

Ms. Durham supported nomination and said clearly the architecture speaks for itself. She said the rear mechanical doesn't significantly impact the ability to convey significance. She echoed Mr. Guo's comments and wanted more information on being the only YMCA and YWCA chapter in Seattle. What contributions did they make in the community or in the City? She asked about school of social work association. She supported including the interiors highlighted in the recommendation.

Mr. Freitas supported nomination based on staff's recommendation. He said it is an opportunity to think about Tudor Revival in the University District. He said it is part of a larger whole.

Ms. Johnson said the university buildings are so well taken care of. She said there are so many Tudor Revival buildings in the neighborhood. She said it is a very nice building. She said the architecture is nice and the YMCA history is interesting. She agreed with the Staff Report.

Mr. Coney wanted more information on the YMCA and YWCA and any connection to the School of Social Work.

Ms. Barker supported nomination. She noted the yearbook photo of the YMCA and membership, yell captains, etc. She supported staff's recommendation but wanted to

include the whole building and pare back in case there is something that is amazing inside.

Ms. Durham said she appreciated the way Ms. Doherty created the recommendation the way she did.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of University of Washington Eagleson Hall at 1417 NE 42nd Street 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 exterior of the building; and the interior of the original north Entry Lobby, Main Lounge, Social Room, Writing Room, and connecting hallways and stair; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 19, 2019; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

051519.52

Conover House
1620 16th Avenue

Rabbi Will Berkovitz, CEO, Jewish Family Services, provided an overview of services provided over its 127 years in the City. He said they help families achieve well-being and stability and serve all religious backgrounds. He said the purchase of this house furthers that mission and is the best way to serve clients and redevelop. He said they did not support designation as it will interfere with their mission financially. He said the needs are growing to serve the vulnerable; they take integrity seriously.

Susan Boyle, BOLA Architecture, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and neighborhood which, she said, were part of the general expansion of Seattle in the late 19th Century when transportation routes developed. In 1891, an electric trolley line was constructed along Broadway Avenue, linking Capitol Hill to both First and Beacon Hills. The street was paved in 1903 and quickly became a favorite route for cyclists, and then motorists. Between 1907 and 1909, trolley routes were extended along 15th, 19th, and 23rd Avenues, and the Bellevue-Summit line was added in 1913. East-west streetcar lines included Pike Street, Madison Street, and the Yesler-Jackson route. Transportation routes and neighborhood commerce has continued to follow the pattern established by early streetcar and cable car routes.

She said that in 1884 Seattle was a small pioneer town. C. T. Conover was a journalist at the Tacoma Ledger then moved to Seattle and worked at the Seattle Post Intelligencer. He and his wife Mary Louise Burns had two children, Tallmadge and Cecil. In 1888, he formed Crawford & Conover with another P-I reporter, Samuel Leroy Crawford. Crawford & Conover were real estate and financial brokers, and after a slow start, became quite successful. Crawford & Conover platted the Renton addition on behalf of the Rentons; it was about 27 blocks with 280 lots. She said the area was popular and the lots sold quickly.

She said the house was constructed in 1893 as an L-shape. Between 1937 and 1954, a new addition had been constructed at the southeast corner, which changed its footprint from an L-shape to a U-shape. She said the neighborhood is rich in variety of housing

and design. She said that Conover was known for working with Somervell and Cote but that she could not find anything about the house architect. She said that Conover lived in the house for 30 years. He invested in mining and platted 25 plats throughout the City. He died in 1961.

In mid-May 1929, following the death of P. Kennard White, C. T. Conover announced the emergency close-out sale of the firm's remaining properties and the establishment of a successor, the Walter M. Fisher Company. In early 1930, the "double tragedy" of a murder and suicide involving Clayton Crawford, led C.T. Conover to announce the liquidation of all the firm's real estate. Conover's firm remained in business, and he eventually retired from it in 1941. By 1944 he sold the company to two young real estate developers, Albert Balch and Ralph Jones.

Ms. Boyle said Conover had a summer house in Laurelhurst and lived in other places. In the 1920s the house was divided into four residences. The house was sold in 1927 and was later taken over by the bank. Conover was also known for his writing; he wrote letters every day and following his retirement, he began writing a column in the *Seattle Times*. He lobbied to keep Mt. Rainier's name, 'Mt. Rainier'. He collected reminiscences for pioneers. She said there is no significant association to the house with Conover and his first wife. She said his mark on the City was through professional work and writing; he lived in apartments and spent the last two decades of his life on Bainbridge Island.

She said the building at 1620 16th Avenue is one of many singular style houses in the neighborhood. It appears to be a variant on the Colonial Revival style, with symmetrical composition, narrow wood siding, portico with curved element, paired columns, bellcast roof shape, tympanum. She said changes included addition of poured-in-place concrete foundations, front porch landing, steps, and cheek blocks; Raising of the floor level or lowering of the front grade to accommodate a basement apartment, along with its new, small single-hung windows in the exposed foundation wall, and entry; replacement of the fine scale horizontal wood siding with taller, grooved asbestos shingles with a 10" exposure, and removal decorative wood pilasters on the front façade and wide corner trim; removal of decorative window trim on the front facade, and installation of window shutters; replacement of turned wood balusters with painted metal railings at front porch and portico; construction of a single-story, flat roof addition at the southeast corner; and, addition of a wood-framed landing and stairs on the back, to exit the second-floor units, along with a secondary back stair from the south unit.

Ms. Boyle said the house is setback with narrow setbacks on back side and an apartment building to the north; there is a wide variety of uses including retail, offices, mixed use, and single and multi-family housing. She said the primary façade has trim on windows and original porch columns and said there was never an entry to the basement. She said the wings are symmetrical and noted the cornice trim is carried around. When converted to apartments another kitchen was added to the back. She said the interior flooring is oak and oak resilient parquet. She noted the original wood paneling and rail around openings and typical five-panel doors.

She said the house does not meet criteria A or B. Conover was an important businessman and writer and was involved in real estate throughout the city. She said nothing cited this as his home. She said he did his writing elsewhere and there is no

significant association with this house. She said the building did not meet Criterion C as it relates to a general pattern of development. She noted the continued change and variety in this rich neighborhood. She said there is no double significance. She said while there are some elements left, it doesn't have the integrity to meet Criterion D. She said it doesn't meet criteria E or F.

Abby DeWeese of Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson, attorney for the owner, said they do not support the nomination as it will hurt the non-profit's ability to provide services. She cited SMC 25.12.580 as it relates to economics. She said it didn't meet criteria A, B, or E. Regarding Criterion B, she said it should be significantly associated with Conover, but it is interesting that he converted the home into apartments. Regarding Criterion D, changes made in proportion of building affect the integrity. She said the house is not prominent and is set back so does not meet Criterion F.

Mr. Hodgins asked if the house was in the city database/inventory.

Ms. Boyle said she didn't think so, but it was in the Steinbrueck Nyberg survey.

Mr. Hodgins said he was unclear about the timeline when the family lived in the house.

Ms. Boyle said it was built in 1893 and per the Polk Directory: in 1907 Conover had a summer home; in 1908 he let it out; in 1922 he was living in Olympic Apartments; in 1925 the house was converted into apartments; and a 1926 advertisement listed apartments 'just like home' for rent.

Ms. Durham asked about the quote Conover made about house.

Ms. Boyle said he was just 'cognating': laid plans for a home, moved in; a street of joys and major sorrows for more than 30 years.

Ms. Barker asked for clarification of Steinbrueck Nyberg inventory.

Ms. Boyle said there were several categories, worthy of landmark, and they noted this property as "significant to community".

Public Comment:

Marvin Anderson supported nomination and noted the significance of the sophistication of composition. He said there is detail inside as well and he noted the fireplaces and stairs. He said when converted to apartments, Conover saved interior details. He said the house was built at an early date, 1893, just when the style became popular – it was modern at the time. He said the house embodies the style and maintains integrity.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, supported nomination. He said the house is close to his office; it is set apart from the street and conveys its presence. He said it has elegant proportions and is a great example of the style. He said it is a dignified Colonial Revival residence and has provided high quality affordable housing for 95

years. He noted the changing quality of the neighborhood and said it meets Criterion F.

Tom Heuser, Capitol Hill Historical Society, supported nomination on criteria B, C, D, and F. He said Conover was part of the growth of Seattle and was directly involved with the Madison cable railway project in 1892. He said Conover offered buyers one-year free passes for cable cars ensuring riders. Conover was a leading force in the development of East Seattle. He platted and sold several more tracts of land in the area including one named "Conover Park" platted in 1907. He originally reserved a large portion of it to be the site for his future home, but later partitioned and sold it off after his wife passed away. He said that Conover may have played a role in the railroad's establishment here--a point worth exploring further. Aside from Conover's ties to the Great Northern Railroad, the Seattle City Council appointed him to a street renaming and renumbering committee in 1892 which led to standardizing the city's street and numbering system. He said the house is associated in a significant way with the life of a person. He said Conover could have sold the house to be torn down but kept control and converted the house to apartments. He said when Louise Conover went to France, she went to pick furniture for this house. He said that Louise is listed as buyer of plat under the name "Burns". He said Conover refers to the house as 'my home' and is specific about who he wants to live there.

Candace Faber said she is a resident in the house. She said the multi-family nature of the house is important and to adapt the house to provide housing for teachers was a radical idea. She said she cleans houses for a living and it means a lot for her to live in this house. She said she is in touch with many who have lived in the house and called it a community-rooted place. She commented that people stop in front of the house and express grief about its future. She said neighbors have lunch on the stoop. She said the lot next door is poorly stewarded and the house should be considered on its own merits.

Marty Nelson, President of Jewish Family Service said that JFS owns the parking lot; it is an odd shape and there is no other use for it. He said they want to be able to combine these lots to use them efficiently. He said they never noticed the house at all until notification the agency purchased it. He said it is not prominent on the street or neighborhood. He said JFS serves vulnerable people; if designated, it will hinder that.

Keara Kazanjian, JFS, said regarding Criterion B, Conover was fascinating and successful; less is known about Crawford. She said Conover was not sentimental; he was a businessman who understood the value of the property and investment. Regarding Criterion C, she said it was a time of tremendous development. The house is not singularly representative, and all the changes make a big difference. She said the house has a significantly different presence with wide siding and it doesn't have the same impact. She said the house is not prominent; it is not differentiated in age and is not used for wayfinding and doesn't meet Criterion F. She said no one called it the Conover House. She said they have been transparent and open with negotiations.

Joan Zegree, previous property owner, supported nomination and said it is a 19th Century building. She said she owned it for 40 years. She said Conover got to Seattle in 1888 and set out to fix the City and did that for the rest of his 99 years. She said

he addressed the passion of what he brought in long deep rut. He had a successful real estate business; he was connected to what he wrote about; Conover was doing branding before it was a thing; he was widely published it was not just cogitation; and he had the means to build what he wanted. In 1961, six months before Conover's death, Governor Albert D. Rossellini dedicated a monument with this inscription and planted a seedling tree in Olympia in honor of Mr. Conover: "*A patriot, historian and writer who dedicated his life to the development of Washington which he named The Evergreen State.*"

Spider Kedelsky, said he was director of community programs at Town Hall. He supported nomination. He said that not every building is replaceable; it is a piece of art. He noted the skill and manhours that went into its construction and even the lumber can't be found anymore. He said the craftspeople are not here to speak for their work; we are. He said Conover House's craftsmanship is inspiring.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Hodgins said '1893' got his attention; it is extant in good condition and unique. It is clear Conover was significant to the community, beyond that is his association with this house enough. He wasn't sure. He said for 15-20 years it was held as an investment. Hearing how he talked about property, he took great care of it. He said the house does retain a significant amount of character. When they excavated the yard, it impacted the siding. He noted the removal of pilasters. He said that inside is more intact. He said P. J. Sullivan house was more significant and he didn't support that one. He noted changes to the porch, foundation and said he was 'on the fence'.

Mr. Guo said he was 'on the fence'. He said it feels different especially with the pilasters gone. On the flip side, this house feels special especially what surrounds it; it stands out. He said the report said that Conover devised the 10% down, 30-year mortgage plan which is standard. He said he was learning towards supporting nomination.

Ms. Johnson said she was 'on the fence' but was leaning toward supporting on criteria B, D, and F. She said Conover was a player in the early days of Seattle and noted the remarkable change from 1880s – 1960. She said he was an interesting person who was doing everything. It is hard to judge the connection to the house. She said the shutters detract as does the change in siding and loss of pilasters. She said the contrast in age and siting is noticeable. She said she was leaning toward supporting. She said the house is so old and it is remarkable what is left. She said the interior is remarkable.

Mr. Coney said the house is a survivor; it is pre-1900 and there are few of this vintage and some recent losses. He said the gutters are distracting. He said there is no reversing the back additions. Regarding the association with Conover, he said Conover was a significant person with a life well-lived, but he wasn't sure about his connection to the house. He was hesitant without more facts. He said that given what has happened he was leaning toward supporting but said he was pessimistic on its survival.

Ms. Durham supported nomination. She said she appreciated the work JFS does in serving vulnerable populations in the City. She said that here the board evaluation is

per the criteria and the merits of the house as a landmark. She said she appreciated the concern about changes but said that criteria B, D, and F were relevant. She said that Conover was significant to the City and State. This house, if he didn't write here or mention it was his home of 30 years...joy to sorrow, wrote of his son remember growing up there. He didn't necessarily write about it but that doesn't negate the connection to him and doesn't need to be justified. She noted changes but said it still reads 'Colonial Revival'. She said the siding is not an irreversible change. She said the board just nominated another with an addition. She said it meets Criterion F; it contrasts in age and is set back in a way that sets it apart as a distinctive feature.

Mr. Freitas said that he is 'on the fence'; the house has issues, but he supported nomination. He said he was hesitant to recognize Conover as significant but there was more to him than he realized. He said that Conover was more than a wealthy developer. He said did not find the building's style to be significant; he didn't support Criterion D. The house was built in 1893 and it is remarkable that it is here. It is not a style associated with Seattle. He said Criterion F is what makes it a landmark in a literal sense; he noted the siting, the setback. He said in other places, landmark is in association with historical figures. He said it doesn't take a lot; the association is there. He said there is more about Conover and his impact on the State. He was involved in clarification of street names and numbers and wondered if that is enough to recognize significance and if there is more to know.

Ms. Barker said Conover was so involved with City and State; he did a great job of promoting Seattle and Washington, not himself. She supported nomination on Criterion B. She said whoever put shutters on knew pilasters were there. She said she was pleased with the structure as seen and said it picks up on Criterion D. She agreed that the setback was generous and that within a decade, setbacks were modified. She agreed with the staff recommendation.

Ms. Doherty recommended referring to the building as the apartment building in the motion.

Except for Mr. Hodgins, board members said they supported inclusion of interior.

Ms. Doherty said it is rare for her to recommend the entire interior, but that it could be refined at designation following a tour. She said it's difficult to tell from the nomination what to include.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Conover House at 1620 16th Avenue 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 exterior of the apartment building; and the interior of the apartment building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 19, 2019; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RC/KD 6:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Hodgins opposed.

051519.6

STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator