



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 768/15

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, November 18, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson  
Deb Barker  
Nick Carter  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel  
Aaron Luoma  
Jeffrey Murdock, Chair  
Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon  
Mike Stanley

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

Acting Chair Jeffrey Murdock called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

#### **111815.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

October 21, 2015

MM/SC/RK/DB

7:0:2 Minutes approved. Messrs. Murdock and Carter abstained.

Some applications were reviewed out of agenda order.

#### **111815.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION**

111815.21 Union Stables

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

2200 Western Avenue

Ms. Sodt described the Special Tax Valuation program and reported that work was performed in accordance with a Certificate of Approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board. She provided details of work and provided photos for board members to review. She said the submitted rehabilitation costs were \$15,525,171 and eligible rehabilitation costs were \$15,506,538; \$18,633 costs were disallowed.

*Mr. Luoma arrived at 3:34 pm.*

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Union Stables, located at 2200 Western Avenue, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/NC/DB            7:0:2    Motion carried. Mr. Stanley recused himself. Mr. Luoma abstained.

**111815.3            CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

111815.32            Frederick and Nelson Building  
500 Pine Street  
Proposed exterior signage

Steve Zamberlin, National Signs, explained work already underway on the building. He explained that the canopy is under construction and the sign will go above the windows. He said the sign will be on aluminum panel structure with push-through plexi glass. He said the sign will be halo-lit and will be subtle and in line with their branding. He said the signs will be set back from sidewalk as well as from glazing.

Ms. Barker said ARC liked what was presented and supported it. She said the signs are over doors only.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed signage at the Frederick & Nelson Building at 500-524 Pine Street, as per the application submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 118716 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and 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/DB/AL 10:00 Motion carried.

## **111815.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

111815.51 Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse  
2815 Elliott Avenue  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill, explained the request for a three to six month extension. He said they are working with architect and be before the ARC before that.

Ms. Sodt supported a six-month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse, 2815 Elliott Avenue, for six months.

MM.SC/RK/NC 10:00 Motion carried.

## **111815.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

111815.31 Harvard Belmont  
1111 Bellevue Pl E  
Proposed removal of a tree and replanting of a tree

Ms. Nashem explained the application for retroactive approval of emergency removal of tree. She said that at the site visit the ARC discussed that there were manholes for vaults at both ends of the street and no existing trees between them. She said she contacted SDOT to see if there were any known utilities that run along the planting strip; SDOT said there were no known utilities located there and that typically there are not utilities in the planting strip, but at the time of SDOT application for a planting permit, they would do a utilities locate to be sure. In the case that they found utilities that prevented the tree from being planted in locations that the applicant identified, the applicant would have to come back for an alternative location. If the location is viable, the tree would have to be planted a minimum of 5 feet from the vault.

Mr. Luoma said the tree removal was reasonable for the condition of the tree and noted damage to rockery wall. He said that of the three site options he prefers location 3. He said if there are no utilities it provides more breathing room and space to grow. He said another location not proposed– along Boylston – has a large planting strip but overhead wires; they could plant smaller trees there. He said he prefers Maple for longevity and noted that Ash pores are damaging Ash trees so he did not recommend an Ash.

Ms. Barker asked about maintenance of tree in right of way and asked if tree could be planted in rockery.

Mr. Luoma discouraged planting in rockery and said that owners are responsible for trees in right of way. He said that Harvard Belmont committee members supported planting tree in location 3 only and to come back if that doesn't work.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for removal of one birch tree and replant with one new tree: Hedge Maple in (location 3) at least 5 feet from the edge of the existing vault per the submittal.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed restorations plans as presented November 18, 2015 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the district as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

3. Landscaping:

Guideline: Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.

Guideline: Maintain the alignment and spacing of street trees. Planting street trees where none now exist is encouraged. Existing street trees are important and pruning should be done only in a professional manner to maintain the trees health and to retain the natural form.

*The existing trees will be replaced with another tree where street trees are lacking.*

MM/SC/AL/NC            10:0:0 Motion carried.

**111815.4            NOMINATION**

111815.41            Maritime Building  
911 Western Avenue

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Mr. McCullough said that the Maritime Building was denied nomination in August 2009. He said they do not support nomination.

David Peterson, NK Architects, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and neighborhood. He

said the site was in what was known as the Commission District – an area full of produce and grocery wholesalers where goods arrived every day because there was no refrigeration. He said that Pike Place Market was developed as a backlash against ongoing corruption in the district. He said that after the great fire the area was quickly rebuilt with sheds, corrugated metal buildings. He said that in 1905 larger more substantial buildings were constructed; this building was constructed in 1909 on land leased from the Railway. He said that Pike Place Market was developing at this time and this building was only partly occupied by Commission companies. He said there were a variety of tenants over time.

He said that the Maritime Building could be described as Eclectic Commercial but lacks architectural ornament. The structure is largely utilitarian and derives its appearance from repetition of materials and simple proportions. The building is five stories in height with a basement consisting of a single floor. Exterior walls are load-bearing cast-in-place concrete, plastered and painted, or simply painted, on the interior, and painted on the exterior. The lines left by the board forms are evident on the exterior. The interior structure is heavy timber post-and-beam construction with wood “car decking” floors, designed for 250 pounds per square foot loads. The roof structure is also heavy timber and wood decking. The roof is low-slope with built-up asphalt roofing. Four elevator/stairwell penthouses project above main roof level at the west side. Because the site is primarily tidelands and fill, with a high water table, the superstructure is supported by driven wood piles with concrete pile caps. The structure has not been significantly reinforced for improved earthquake resistance since its original construction.

The building was designed to have commercial storefronts at street level along the main elevation facing Western Avenue, with additional smaller storefronts wrapping the north and south sides along Madison and Marion Streets. The rear or western side of the building, facing the waterfront, appears to have been designed for loading and unloading, but did not feature unusually large openings, loading docks, or anything of the sort. The building was organized into four discrete sections on each floor separated by east-west concrete walls running the full width of the building, presumably for fire control as well as structural requirements. This created a series of long narrow commercial spaces for primary tenants with frontage along both the waterfront and Western Avenue elevations. Interior spaces could be subdivided by the tenant. Upper floors may have been initially arranged similarly. Each of the four sections were designed to have a freight elevator and secondary stair near the western exterior wall. Additionally, two small ground floor entry lobbies and stairs were located at the center of the north and south exterior walls, although were not built in narrower bays as indicated on the original drawings. The three main building entries were located where these demising walls met the eastern exterior wall, along Western Avenue, each which featured a vestibule and stair. The current passenger elevator at the center entry lobby is a modern replacement of one originally located there. He said that commercial storefronts have all been changed except for a few on the

west side. He said that 2/3 of the windows have been replaced in-kind. He said that the interior has been reconfigured. He said the basement has been adapted to parking.

Mr. Peterson provided local stylistic comparables to this building: Seattle Hardware, Schwabacher, Olympia Warehouse, Pacific Net & Twine, Polson, and the 619 Western buildings. He said that this building is different in that it does not have concrete frame – it has post and beam.

He explained that E. W. Houghton was born in 1856 in England and moved to Seattle in 1889. He said that he partnered with Charles Saunders and following the Great Fire they were very busy. He said that Houghton did lots of physically large buildings with grouped windows separated by punched openings. He said that Stone and Webster constructed the building and built utilities and streetcars in early Seattle, Georgetown Power Plant, Steam Plant, Metropolitan tract – they were good at building large buildings.

Mr. Peterson said that it is an interesting building but not significant enough to meet any criteria; he said it has no integrity and there have been alterations over time. He said that the building is associated with the Commission District but not significantly so. He said that it is a straightforward utilitarian eclectic commercial building that is typical of work by Houghton. He said the building is not exceptional.

Mr. McCullough commented that the board six years ago voted 8 -1 against nomination. He said he echoed Mr. Peterson's conclusions. He said it was in the late stages of the Commission District and held more of a smorgasbord of offices. He said the form is intact – it is old and nice – but not a landmark.

Ms. Barker asked if the red band was paint or brick.

Mr. Peterson said it is painted concrete.

Mr. Ketcherside said the Colman Building is similar in character and has a professional mix in there as well and should be a comparison to this building. He said that Lucien August has retail arm there. He said there is lots of small adornment – simple o-rings to attach a cable to hold up awning on west, curly cues on building.

Mr. Peterson said he thought those were utility attachments.

Mr. Ketcherside said that Western had streetcars and maybe the o-rings were for that use.

Mr. Luoma asked about west side changes regarding delivery areas.

Mr. Peterson said that there is no raised loading area indicated. He said that most entrances have been replaced and infilled. He said there are some original openings and some old awning frames. He said that over time most openings have been replaced. He said that there is more original fabric on the Western Ave. side.

Mr. Murdock asked about the John Deere sign.

Mr. Peterson said they had an office there.

Ms. Barker asked about the west façade and noted that the storefront went out to railroad.

Mr. Peterson said that it related to the viaduct going in. He said that in the tax photo it looks flush.

Mr. McCullough said the sidewalks are sinking.

Ms. Patterson said that the nomination report says the west side is designed for loading and unloading; she asked what features told you this is designed for loading.

Mr. Peterson said that because it is a warehouse and its location on water. He said that there are numerous people doors and not large scale openings. He said that maybe for boxes or small machinery deliveries.

Ms. Barker asked if the freight elevators were larger than the doors.

Mr. Peterson said they are the same.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the grouping of the reinforced concrete structure buildings.

Mr. Peterson said that in 1905, 1906 and 1907 there was an explosion of reinforced concrete buildings with some of the oldest on the west coast here.

Mr. Murdock noted the flexibility to the style for small startup businesses and asked if any significant businesses were located in the building.

Mr. Peterson said he had not researched that.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside commented that there was a high level integrity of fenestration and noted in-kind replacement. He said that the storefronts still reflect the original character of the design.

Ms. Barker noted the integrity and the utilitarian style made the building very flexible and usable. She said it is not exciting or show-y; it is a solid and bland building. She said she wanted to support it because it is so intact.

Mr. Stanley said it failed designation six years ago. He noted the importance of the building to the neighborhood.

Ms. Anderson supported nomination and said it is a simple utilitarian building. She noted the way it interacts with surrounding buildings and said it meets the threshold. She supported nomination to allow further discussion.

Mr. Luoma said its prominent location on the Waterfront adjacent to the terminal warrants further consideration. He said there are only so many of these. He said that this one is simple in style and form. He said it served its function early on. He questioned if the building could tell its story. He said to compare it to how other warehouse buildings along the waterfront served function in transition to design related service industry. He said it may not rise above the rest. He said the building could be associated with the working waterfront and be significant to City. He supported nomination to pay attention to location and its prominent location and questioned if it can convey its connection to the working waterfront.

Mr. Carter said it is a nice utilitarian building and shows on the outside what it is. He said he has trouble seeing it as a landmark and there are many other warehouse buildings in the area with more character. He said he was willing to support nomination.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination and said if the only designated buildings were the crème de crème it would not paint an authentic view of the past. She said there are many support buildings. She said this is a background but prominent building. She said that it takes up a city block and it honest in what it is. She said it has always had a diverse mix of occupants and it is interesting in how the building has allowed for flexibility over the years.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination on criteria C and D and said it is associated with a part of the vibrant economic center and part of Seattle's formative role as a fast growing urban center. He said warehouses indirectly supported transportation hub but he wasn't sure if it was in a significant way. He said the building played maybe a supporting rather than leading role in Commission District. He said that the design is not conducive to loading and maybe it was leading in the transition to catering to new types of businesses. He said that way the loading area was designed was for smaller commercial products and grocery. He said options were kept open for renters. He said he gave more weight to Criterion D as a

Commission District warehouse type. He noted the fenestration and tripartite arrangement. He said the building is an early in 20<sup>th</sup> Century style; it is utilitarian which is a distinct characteristic of these buildings. He said it is made of reinforced concrete. He said that Stone & Webster had a good resume for building these buildings and he noted the efficiency techniques.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination and said the building was an incubator of certain types of businesses; it was above and beyond ‘warehouse’. He said the waterfront is a compelling part of Seattle’s story. He said it is significant that the building fills a full city block. He said it is a utilitarian, working building.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination – architecturally and its use. He questioned if it housed printers or other items for grocers. He noted its proximity to other Commission buildings. He said that it is part of the entry point to Seattle from the ferry. In 1910 there were a few entry points – Colman Dock and dedicated piers for companies early on.

Ms. Barker said she would like more information about the variety of uses over time and their durations.

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 January 6, 2016; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/DB/MSN 9:0:0 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

*Mr. Stanley left at 5:05 pm.*

**111815.6 BRIEFING**

111815.61 Volunteer Park  
1400 E. Prospect Street  
Briefing on proposed removal / replacement of bandshell, and site improvements

Briefing PowerPoint and handouts are in DON file.

Owen Richards explained the proposal to enhance the amphitheater space. He provided an historical overview of the design of the park, where the first bandshell was located and where the current amphitheater is now. Key issues being looked at are accessibility and ADA compliance; improved performance quality, enhanced acoustic quality, adding backstage support space, weather protection, addressing sun / glare for audience, improving lighting and wayfinding, and public restrooms. He said they want to expand uses to include dance and education programs. He said they are looking at A) keeping the

existing stage and redeveloping the back area and shape of stage and B) an alternative location with better orientation (not looking into sun). He said the alternative location would allow the original Olmstead pathway to be recreated, and the stage to be more recessive.

Mr. Luoma questioned what the primary view was. He said that multiple views were created but the most important was the east west axis as well as the north south internal vistas. He said there are some external vistas from within the park.

Mr. Ketcherside said the water tower is an anchoring element. He said the bandshell was disruptive even historically, and he preferred going back to a more Olmsted friendly type design.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma asked about drainage.

Mr. Richards said that there is some sogginess.

Mr. Luoma said to ensure there is drainage. He asked if alternative B was introducing another location / axis.

Mr. Richards said they would align the entry to the Asian Art Museum.

Chris Jones said that Alternative B would set into the natural topography and the stage would sit a bit lower with less visual obstruction. He said that it is a more pastoral landscape.

Mr. Sneddon said the idea of an amphitheater was antithetical to Olmsted's design.

Mr. Jones said that the intent of some sort of performance space with bandshell along with original intent of park design fits in with the alternative B location and its more pastoral views.

Mr. Sneddon said the original was deliberately put along the roadway and now it would be in a more pastoral setting.

Mr. Richards said that the stage would be constructed but the rest will be embedded in the landscape. He said the original pergola was vine-covered and they have taken cues from that. He said they will wed the landscape with the structure.

Mr. Ketcherside said the Olmsteds were resistant to play areas which he said illustrates the difference between the use of the bandshell pergola and current day use. He asked why they would design city scale events at Volunteer Park.

Mr. Murdock said it is significant to think of what was behind the design now and then. He appreciated moving the bandshell and noted the contrast of the built and forested environment. He said reorienting the bandshell is good.

Mr. Ketcherside said he was troubled by further changes.

Mr. Murdock said that Alternative B pushes into the right direction. He said the hardscape needs to become quiet. He said that views in the park are important and need to be considered. He said it needs to become a quiet element.

Ms. Barker preferred Alternative B which she said gives more ability for behind the scenes functionality.

Mr. Luoma said it is challenging and noted that the historic character of the park should be prioritized.

Mr. Kiel asked if this is the only part of the park being considered and if there might be a more appropriate spot.

Mr. Richards said they need a natural slope and this is the only place in the park that has that. He also noted the size of space as the only appropriate one. He asked board members for input on the roof structure concepts.

Ms. Barker preferred the shell.

Mr. Kiel agreed with Ms. Barker and said he likes the shell as an acoustical solution.

Mr. Ketcherside said it is nice to have contrasting proposals as a discussion point.

Mr. Luoma said to look at options for temporary roof coverings.

Mr. Murdock said the proposal should be of its time and express its function.

Mr. Sneddon said he would like to hear more about how the design philosophy fits with the Olmsted vision.

Jennifer Ott, Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks, described a letter written by Frederick Law Olmsted that may help provide some guidance.

**111815.7 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator