



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 358/09

### MINUTES

#### Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4080

Wednesday, July 1, 2009 – 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen, Vice Chair

Marie Strong

Tom Veith

Mollie Tremaine

Meredith Wirsching

Alyce Conti

Sean Peterfreund

Mark Hannum

Steve Savage

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Sarah Sodt

Rebecca Frestedt

#### Absent

Stephen Lee

Christine Howard

Acting Chair Tom Veith called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

#### **070109.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meeting of June 3, 2009

MM/SC/MT/SS

7:0:0 Minutes approved as amended.

*Vice Chair Vernon Abelsen arrived at 3:40 p.m.*

#### **070109.2 BOARD BUSINESS**

##### 070109.21 Fire Station #13

3601 Beacon Ave. S.

Clarification on legal description for portion of parcel included in designation

*Ms. Howard and Ms. Strong arrived at 3:44p.m.*

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Ms. Chave explained that when designated in 2005 the designated features included the site and the exterior of the building, excluding the 1986-87 addition. The legal description listed on the nomination form and subsequently on the Designation Report was for the entire City-owned parcel, which includes all of the Beacon Hill Reservoir and Jefferson Park, approximately 44 acres. However, a smaller site map for the site of the Fire Station #13 property was included in the nomination application. She explained in the designation of the site, the Board's intent was to designate the site as depicted on the site map (attached). She said the City's Fleets and Facilities Department has recently provided a legal description of this smaller site area (see attachment to Staff Report). It is necessary for the Board to act on the attached legal description for the property in order to clarify the site area controlled. She explained that both legal descriptions are needed for the Ordinance.

Mr. Abelsen noted that the site map had no date and the project number is cut off and he wasn't sure what the drawing number "M-1" is associated with.

Ms. Chave said she was aware that the site map (prepared by an architect consultant for Fleets) had no date on it. She said in the proposed motion she has asked that minor modifications are deferred to the description or the site map to Board Staff because this is the latest site map that Fleets and Facilities has; if adjustments are made it will be a matter of a few feet. She said in the nomination the consultant acknowledged a site map from 1986-87 and this drawing may be from that time period. If there is a substantial deviation they would have to come back to Board but for small corrections would come to Board Staff.

Mr. Abelsen said he noted it was stamped and by an architect rather than by a surveyor.

Mr. Veith said architects often put a note on drawing saying "it is not a survey". He suggested changing "defers" to "assigns".

Ms. Strong noted in the proposed motion the property description is referred to as "attached property description" and this document is called the "legal" description and noted there is a difference between the two.

It was determined that "property description" would be changed to "attached legal description".

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen stated that two changes were being made to the proposed motion

Action: I move that the Board approve the attached legal description for the designated site of Fire Station #13 at 3601 Beacon Ave. S; noting that this legal description is for a portion of parcel # 1624049270, the parcel noted in the Designation Report. The Board assigns any minor modifications or corrections to the legal description and site map to the Board staff.

MM/SC/TV/MH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

**070109.3 DESIGNATION**

070109.31 Fire Station #9 Substation/Annex  
3829 Linden Ave. N

Mr. Abelsen noted numerous public comments were received on this application.

Theresa Rodriguez, Fleets and Facilities, explained the Fire Levy program that will remodel or replace eight stations in the City. She said this station is part of that levy, and that is why Fleets is presenting the nomination at this time- to know whether it is a landmark or not. She introduced Sue Rosenthal, Seattle Fire Department.

Ms. Rosenthal provided an operations overview of the station. She said this building is too small for equipment for fire fighters to do their job. It is only big enough for two vehicles.

Susan Boyle, BOLA Architects, presented the report (full text in DON file) and provided context of the site. She went over building details – decorative sgraffito, simple punched windows, symmetrical front with primary entry, arched openings, and original brick surround and noted changes that have been made. She provided an overview of the Gamewell Company fire alarm equipment and noted that Washington was one of nine states that purchased the Gamewell system. She explained the alterations that were made to the building.

Ms. Boyle said architect Daniel Huntington designed other fire stations – station numbers 37, 14, 16 and 13. She said she didn't think this station met the threshold criteria.

Ms. Rosenthal said she did not support designation.

Ms. Rodriguez noted the importance of keeping up with changing equipment and technology and the ability to accommodate that. She said the Fleets and

Facilities Dept. has recognized the historical and architectural value of other fire stations by nominating them but is neutral about this building.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wirsching asked if this was the only building of its kind that had a signal house.

Ms. Boyle said the building had other functions and she was not sure if it was the only signal house.

Mr. Abelsen noted the exterior bracket was probably for future expansion.

Ms. Boyle replied that she didn't see anything that pointed to that. In response to other questions she noted there are a lot of collectibles in the basement – record keeping, binders, and a wheel.

Ms. Chave stated that one of the fire fighters (present on the tour) claimed to know the whereabouts of the original doors.

Public Comment:

Valerie Bunn, Fremont Historical Society, supported designation and spoke on behalf of Carol Tobin. She cited Criteria C, D and F and said it is distinctive and reflects a period of construction; it fits in with the neighborhood; and with regard to the signal system it is the only one of its type left.

Erik Pihl, Fremont Historical Society, said the building is much loved in the neighborhood, He said that twenty-one years ago they worked with the Fire Department to retain the building. He spoke of the importance of Huntington's design and that the building was sensitive to the neighborhood. He called the alterations to the door "unfortunate". He said that everyone in Fremont knows the building. He supported designation.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said it was a difficult decision and said it did not meet Criteria A, B, D, E and F. She said that Criterion C might be applicable because of the significance of the signal equipment, but it is not there anymore. She said she would not support designation.

Mr. Savage noted the importance of the history of the alarm and signal equipment but said he would not support designation.

Ms. Conti supported designation based on Criterion D and said the modest and functional structure fit into the neighborhood at the time. It is not high style but it served its purpose and is easily recognizable.

Ms. Strong supported designation based on Criterion D and said it is in line with the rest of the neighborhood. She noted the history of the signal equipment.

Ms. Tremaine supported designation based on Criterion D and said that simple buildings are often overlooked but mean something to those in the area. She noted its honesty, boldness, soundness and its modest quality. She said it is a community building.

Mr. Veith did not support designation. With regard to Criterion F he said it is a mid-block building, small and appropriate for the neighborhood. While it catches the eye it doesn't modify or inform a sense of place. He said the building does not meet Criterion D because it is not unusual or distinctive and it not a perfect example of a small or low-scale typology. He said it has a nice front but no continuity or distinctiveness. With regard to Criterion C and its relation to area history, it echoed Fremont's view of itself as the "center of the universe".

Mr. Peterfreund said he agreed with Ms. Wirsching and Mr. Savage. He said the building contributes character to the neighborhood but it doesn't live up to the threshold and he would not support designation.

Mr. Hannum said Criterion C is stronger but that the building does not have the signal instrumentation anymore. He supported designation based on D and said that C and F were also possible. He noted that Fremont looks at it as a landmark.

Mr. Abelsen said it is a diminutive building that blends in with its surroundings. The many letters show community support. He supported designation based on Criterion D although it is missing some materials.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Fire Station #9 Substation/Annex at 3829 Linden Ave N 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/MT/MS

5:4:0 Motion not approved as a designation requires a majority of appoint Board members vote in favor (6 votes in favor required). Ms. Wirsching,

Mr. Savage, Mr. Veith and Mr. Peterfreund opposed.

**070109.4 NOMINATIONS**

070109.41 (former) Sixth Church of Christ, Scientist  
2656 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave. SW

Jennifer Thompson presented the nomination report (full text in DON file) and provided context of the site and then went over the features of the building. She said the primary entry is on the site's western side. This entry is accessed by a broad set of non-original L-shaped stairs leading upward from 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SW. Wrought iron fencing is non-original. She described the brick veneer which covers all four sides which consists of buff-colored rug-tapestry brick with a field of running-bond. All windows have a soldier course header. The parapet is topped with a metal coping. She explained the main roof is flat with membrane roofing while the one-story rear (eastern) portion has a modified hip roof with composition roofing.

Ms. Thompson said the western façade, which is the primary façade and main building entrance from 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW, is symmetrically organized, featuring a central projection with three punctuated bays. She said that four pilasters extending from grade to the top of the parapet articulate the bays to emphasize the vertical elements of the façade. She noted that each pilaster is topped by a soldier brick course. She said cast-iron scones/lanterns are affixed to each pilaster at the mid-point of the door/transom spandrel. Each of the three bays has a pair of six-light non-original French doors, with a painted wooden spandrel above and 20-light wood-sash clerestory.

Owner Dahli Bennett noted that per the former owner (the Christian Science Church ) request quotes on the wall have been covered with paintings.

Ms. Thompson went over interior features and said the foyer has terrazzo tile flooring laid in a pale salmon and gray diagonal checkerboard pattern, plastered stucco walls, and dark wood trims around doors and windows. The tall windows on the north and south elevations naturally illuminate the two-story high former sanctuary space.

Ms. Thompson explained that architect Gerald C. Field designed the church in 1919. She went over other buildings which he designed or assisted with design: Cornish School, McDermott Apartments, China Castle (later the Jolly Roger), and the Oregon Bank in Klamath Falls, Oregon.

Ms. Thompson said the building did not meet Criteria A or B but it could possibly meet Criterion C in that it may be associated with the development of West Seattle/Admiral neighborhood. She said she thought it met Criterion D in that it is atypical to most of the Christian Scientist edifices. She said she

thought it met Criterion E and reviewed Field's work noting his relationship to Bebb and Mendel, his work with Albertson (Cornish School, McDermott Apartments) and said this church is one of his finest designs. She said she thought building met Criterion F because it is an easily identifiable feature of the neighborhood.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum asked about the framework on the roof.

Ms. Bennett said there is a roof top deck that was added and the framework is just 2 x 4 railings on the top.

In response to questions about the interior, owner Dahli Bennett explained the three step stage was added in 2003. She explained that alterations that have been done include the flooring in the main sanctuary, the kitchen, uneven flooring, removed original fir floor and used it elsewhere, and took apart the pews and re-used the wood on the fascia of the balcony. She said there are no original chandeliers left so they installed new. She said the ceiling is all original and the exterior walls and ceiling – all plaster intact. Where new plaster was needed it was matched to old and done by hand. The windows in the front façade originally had metal framework and the glass has been replaced. She said with the remodel she matched the mahogany that was already in the Church. In the main area the whole window structure is new but the openings are original. She said the foyer area and the outside doors are original. She said the outside ramp was done in 1974 when the Church still owned the property and that they also put in the stairs with the railing, ramp and a planter area. She said the fence went up in 2003. In the back alleyway, the glass has been painted over but it is still in the original frame.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching supported nomination based on Criteria D and F and said she was less convinced on E. She said C should be included because it is one of a series of Church of Christ, Scientist, historic structures in the City. It is a significant building to the neighborhood. She also supported nomination based on Criterion F.

Mr. Savage said it did not meet Criterion C and said that Criterion F probably applies although the landscaping covers it so it is probably not noticeable or identifiable during the summer. He said no to Criterion E but supported nomination based on Criteria D and F.

Ms. Conti supported nomination based on Criteria D, E, and F. She said the style was attractive.

Ms. Strong supported nomination but took issue with including the interior of the first floor because it has been changed.

Ms. Tremaine noted the many non-original things that in comparison with other “recent” church designations, this one is not in their league although she would support nomination based on Criterion F.

Mr. Veith noted the clarity of design and that the interior was attractive. He said the exterior does a good job in meeting Criterion D. He said he wasn’t sure about Criterion C. He said Gerald Field, after working with Albertson, picked up some of the design strategies that were developed in Albertson’s later work. He said with regard to Criterion F that the building has a chance for prominence but he wants to take a look at it so will vote yes to nominate.

Mr. Peterfreund supported nomination based on the Staff Report and said it satisfied Criterion D. He thought the building was luxurious and striking. He was less sure about Criterion E but noted it was identifiable so he thought it met Criterion F.

Mr. Hannum supported nomination based on the Staff Report; he was not convinced about Criterion E but will explore it.

Mr. Abelsen noted there was consensus, although not on which criteria. but generally the architecture of the building stood strong. With regard to comments about the first floor interior, although it has been modified there is significant aspect to the volume itself in relationship of the exterior to interior. He noted Mr. Savage’s comment about location and its visibility from the exterior. He said this could partly be due to how it is presented. He thought that could be related more to the architect who has a very small collection of work. He said the fascinating thing about Church of Christ, Scientist, churches is that they borrow from historical designs although this one is atypical of their designs. He supported nomination.

Action: I move approval of the (former) Sixth Church of Christ, Scientist, at 2656 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW 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 first floor of the building, excluding the restrooms and the former readers’ rooms; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for August 5, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MW/TV

9:0:0 Motion carried.

070109.42 Maritime Building  
911 Western Ave.

*Mr. Abelsen recused himself.*

Ms. Sodt explained this building is a Category 1 building in the Downtown Building Survey. She introduced Karin Link who prepared the Nomination Report. She said the owners would have a presentation following Ms. Link's.

Karin Link, Architectural Historian, presented the Nomination Report (full text in DON file) and began by providing context of the site which takes up an entire City block, which is very unusual. The building was originally known as the Pacific Warehouse Building and in a 1912 base map is shown as the Maritime Building. She said a permit to construct the building was issued in 1909 and expired in 1910. She said a note on King County Tax Assessor card includes a pencil notation cost in 1909 of \$185,000. The King County Tax Assessor card, the King County Parcel locator and Royal Elenga's Seattle Architecture Walking Tour all give the 1910 date although the owners' records suggest 1911. She said other nearby buildings take up a half City block. It has strong connections with the Waterfront. The site is in an area which in the 1890s was described as the "entrails of the City". Paul Dorpat, in his book on the Seattle Central Waterfront and its development, asserted that the area was referred to as the Commission District. This same expression shows up in Walt Crowley's National Guide where he talks about its northern boundary being defined as Madison Street. The expression also shows up in Brady Brecks Johnson's "Inside Pike Place Market" in which there is a description of the Commission District as a warehouse district, produce row and an area of light industry. Ms. Link read from Paul Dorpat's book, "in the Commission District the first small sheds and warehouse and corrugated iron built after the '89 fire were replaced in the 20<sup>th</sup> century by more substantial buildings like the Colman Annex, the Maritime Building, the Commission Building, the Polson Building and the old depot at Columbia Street and others. Similarly we can imagine the waterfront of the 1890s as a sprouting adolescent in need of a new wardrobe." The great fire had destroyed the waterfront, everything south of Union Street, sparing only the Schwabacher Dock which became Pier 7 and later renumbered 58.

She provided a historical overview of the Waterfront: the arrival of the Northern Pacific Railroad (provided a photo of the area in 1911); the Bogue Plan and harbor development. She said the area in 1911 was a very active and crowded area. The harbor development was not built by 1911; the plan was revived in 1912 but when put up for vote it was abandoned. She said the Central Waterfront was thriving by 1915 and said the Port of Seattle was the

second most important shipping port in the nation. She noted the substantial buildings that were built in an area previously populated by corrugated sheds.

Ms. Link said the building is associated with the major economic and physical development of the Waterfront and the wholesale warehouse district that was tied to it. She said the physical development of the district was particularly important between the 1900s and the early teens along Western Avenue. This building was one of the substantial buildings that were built at this time. She noted Dennis Anderson's letter in support agrees. She provided photos of the area today and said it meets Criterion C.

The five story Western Avenue façade is vertically organized into three sections. It has a relatively high ground floor, topped by a projecting cornice in concrete. The middle section consists of three floors, also topped by a similar cornice. In the horizontal direction, the façade is divided into three interwoven sections, organized around three entrance bays creating a nice rhythm of fenestration. At the ground level, for instance, each entrance is flanked by three storefronts, with the central entrance sharing three storefronts with each of the other entrances. The entrance bays are narrower than each of the storefront bays and appear to be even taller and narrower, because of ceramic and tile mosaic surrounds. The storefronts have been replaced, which is common for a building of this size, but it is quite intact. She said the building's design uses simple repetitive elements and the repeated rhythm of bays and fenestration which creates a striking whole despite it's being a huge building. She said it is representative of substantial buildings in the area – many of which were warehouse building – built between 1900s and 1910s which was a time of growth in Seattle and this area.

She said the building is organized into a base, middle and top which is frequently found in buildings of the Chicago School. She said the building does embody the distinctive characteristics of the style, method or construction and meets Criterion D.

The architect on this building was Edwin Walker Houghton and Ms. Link went over his partnership with Charles Saunders and examples of their work (the Bailey and Terry-Denny building and the Olympic Block). After the partnership with Saunders ended he went out on his own; buildings from this period have either been demolished or altered; she noted the Lippy and Cannery buildings. She said Houghton's most well-known work outside of the Maritime Building is the Moore Theater and Hotel (he later became known as a theater designer). She quoted a letter from Dennis Anderson (letter in DON file) in which he said this building is a major work by Houghton that meets Criterion E.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked about permits and inspector notations and Ms. Link replied she had found the permit at DPD, but no inspection notes. She said she used the 1912 map and the building is called out on the map.

Owner Comments:

Amy Kosterlitz, representing the Hotson family said the family had been good stewards but the building is not a landmark. She quoted from a letter from Josephine Hotson (letter available in DON file) who said the building has obsolete systems and maintenance needs which make it a hardship to preserve it. Ms. Kosterlitz said Ms. Hotson also pointed out that preserving the building did not make sense because of the Viaduct plans and its location on landfill.

Don Brubeck, Architectural Historian, presented on behalf of the owner who has owned the building for 48 years and who opposes nomination (his full report is on file in DON). He went through the Ordinance and Criteria and noted the building is not cited in the Pioneer Square Boundary extensions, the First Avenue District, Central Waterfront planning studies or previous downtown surveys. He said there is not a lot of interest in the building by the preservation community and that plans for an historic district did not include the building. He went over the Central Waterfront Plan and plans to demolish the Viaduct and showed an illustration that showed buildings as a backdrop to new development and that the Maritime is shown as a backdrop building with banners in front of it.

He said the architectural features that give this building its character are its concrete frame, windows, storefronts and on the inside timber frame and the wide open warehouse bays necessary for its original function. He went over integrity issues and said the windows had been replaced, storefronts had been replaced and interior warehouse bays had been subdivided and changed. He said the interior corridors have been altered often and said the space was open when the warehouse was built.

He said the building was not associated with an important event or person so would not meet A or B.

He said the use of the term "Commission District" was for predecessor buildings. He said that Pike Place Market opened in 1907 so produce row was in decline when the Maritime Building was built. With regard to harbor development he said the Bogue Plan wasn't implemented and Railroad Avenue was a mess. He said the Municipal Ownership Movement created the Port of Seattle. The building was an industrial type business rather a produce row type. The transition from horse and wagon to motor vehicles and from rail to motor vehicles became predominant in the decade of 1911 and by 1930

was just about complete. That development continued as most of the warehouses eventually converted to Class B and C offices.

Mr. Brubeck said the building is not unique nor is it an outstanding work of the designer and it is not a visual landmark. He noted other warehouse buildings that he said were more significant than this one. He said it is not Chicago School and is a plain industrial building. He gave other examples of work by Houghton and said this was not a significant example of his work. He said that Stone and Webster were listed on the title block later and were not listed as structural engineers so he didn't think they did the structural engineering.

He said the building is not identifiable compared to Smith Tower, St. James or the King County Courthouse but it is a good backdrop building.

Mr. Brubeck said the building did not meet Criteria C, D, E or F.

Board Questions:

Ms. Tremaine asked about window replacement and Mr. Brubeck said windows on all floors had been replaced with wood, similar to original.

In response to clarifying questions Mr. Brubeck explained this building was not at the leading edge nor was it at the trailing end of a trend. He said industrial buildings were stripped down versions of what else was going on in the area.

Mr. Veith noted that style is usually not an indicator of significance.

Mr. Brubeck said the building was not Chicago and explained the windows are double hung and the base facing is just what was typical for a warehouse.

Mr. Veith noted the windows are pivot rather than double hung. He asked if when Mr. Brubeck talks of Chicago style he is referring to Chicago Sullivanesque type buildings.

Mr. Brubeck agreed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Kosterlitz said the building does not meet the Criteria and asked the Board not to nominate.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum noted both presentations were persuasive and said he would support nomination to give him time to explore further.

Mr. Peterfreund supported nomination and said the building has a lot of character with its size, simplicity and utilitarian construction. He said it adds to the neighborhood.

Ms. Tremaine said the building does not compare favorably to others that were more interesting and would not support nomination.

Ms. Strong supported nomination and wanted more time to review.

Ms. Conti supported nomination and said it meets the threshold.

Mr. Savage did not support nomination.

Ms. Wirsching said she read both reports and said there is nothing significant about its character or contribution to economic development and would not support nomination.

Mr. Veith said it did not meet Criteria A, B or F. He said it is a typical building in a neighborhood and would be a background building in a district. He said Criterion E is unlikely and Criterion D is tentative. He said it is a common type building and one must be able to say it is the ultimate expression or a well done one. He said he wants more time to review and would support nomination.

Action: I move approval of the Maritime Building at 911 Western 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 exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for August 5, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MH/SP

5:3:1 Motion carried. Mr. Savage, Ms. Tremaine, Ms. Wirsching opposed. Mr. Abelsen recused himself.

**070109.5 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator