



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 774/18

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday November 21, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Manish Chalana

Russell Coney

Rich Freitas

Alan Guo

Garrett Hodgins

Kristen Johnson

### Staff

Erin Doherty

Rebecca Frestedt

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Kathleen Durham

Jordon Kiel

Steven Treffers

Vice-Chair Deb Barker called the meeting to order at 3:42 p.m.

**112118.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
September 19, 2018 Deferred.

**112118.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

112118.21 Columbia City Landmark District  
3815 S. Edmunds St.  
Signs

Ms. Frestedt presented on behalf of the applicant. She explained the proposed installation of vinyl decal window signs and one 2-sided blade sign. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. She said this is a non-contributing building within the Columbia City National Register District. She noted that on November 6, 2018 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Following Committee review, the Committee members recommended approval of the application, as proposed. She said installation is consistent in design and placement; installation will be into mortar joints. She said it is on a non-primary façade.

Mr. Coney asked if the rendering was accurate.

Ms. Frestedt said it is; they used a mock-up of the other sign.

Mr. Freitas asked if there is precedent in the district.

Ms. Frestedt said there is similar building that has similar blades and stanchions. She said it is the same owner and they have a consistent look. Wood is light natural stained. She said there is no illumination. She said the vinyl decal is simple. In response to a question from the Board, she said there will be no A-frame; they are prohibited in Guidelines.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hodgins said it is straightforward.

Mr. Coney said it is reasonable.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage at 3815 S. Edmunds St., as proposed

This action is based on the following:

The proposed signage meets the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

**Guidelines/Specific**

**11. Signs.** All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows, are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications will be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape, texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color, and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that

signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

- a. **Window Signs and Hanging Signs.** Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.
- b. **Blade Signs.** Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

### **Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 and 10**

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

112118.22

Columbia City Landmark District  
3515 S. Alaska St. – Rainier Arts Center  
Exterior alterations

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a canvas awning and frame to be installed on the north façade, from the rear door to the lower level. The proposal includes relocation of an existing light fixture to be installed underneath the canopy. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. The Rainier Arts Center (historically called the Fifth Church of Christ Scientist) was constructed in 1921. It is a contributing building within the Columbia City National Register District. The building is clad with stucco on clay tile with brick trim. On November 6, 2018 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Following Committee review, the Committee members recommended approval of the application, as proposed.

#### Applicant Comment:

Kathy Fowells, SouthEast Effective Development (SEED), explained there is no backstage area for performers; they have to run outside and then downstairs. She proposed a canvas cover as rain screen and said it is the best solution. She said the awning was designed for this building and purpose. The awning frame is powdercoated tan and the fabric is fire resistant. She said the awning was designed for drainage and is removable. Attachment will be into mortar, as much as possible; final location to be determined by structural engineer.

Ms. Frestedt asked if construction drawing shows the sloped section.

Ms. Fowells said the awning is cut across the corner of the frame of the window; they need to do that and have notched it out around the window.

Mr. Freitas noted concern about crossing over section of window.

Mr. Hodgins asked about water drainage.

Ms. Fowells said it will drain off far edge of awning into drainage / dirt area.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hodgins said it is straightforward.

Ms. Johnson said it is reasonable; it is removable, so crossing the corner of the window is OK.

Ms. Frestedt said that recently, a blue tarp had been used; this is an improvement.

*Mr. Guo arrived at 3:55 pm.*

Ms. Barker appreciated their efforts.

Mr. Chalana said the awning takes away from the experience of the façade; it looks makeshift.

Ms. Fowells said they tried everything, and this was the best option.

Mr. Chalana said although it is removable, it could be there for a long time.

Mr. Coney noted it only crosses the corner of the window frame.

Ms. Johnson said because of the way the parking area is, this window is not as visible as others.

Ms. Barker said the focus is really at the lower entrance.

Ms. Johnson said the façade is prominent, but this portion is less so.

Mr. Hodgins said the parking lot is there and this doorway is sunk down.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations at 3515 S. Alaska St., as proposed

This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

**Guidelines/Specific**

**2. Building Materials and Fixtures.** Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

**10. Awnings/Canopies/Marquees.** Marquees, awnings and canopies will be encouraged at street level. Shiny, high-gloss materials are not appropriate. Distinctive architectural features shall not be covered, nor shall installation damage the structure. Awnings may be installed on upper levels, where appropriate.

## Secretary of the Interior's Standards #2, 9 and 10

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

### 112118.3 DESIGNATION

112118.31 Roy Vue Apartments  
615 Bellevue Avenue East

#### Nominator Presentation:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said she was thrilled the building was unanimously nominated. She said that she and Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, would provide an overview and respond to questions the board had a nomination. She said the board asked about whether women residents were attracted to this building. She said she researched and was unable to find that a disproportionate number of women were there. Responding to questions about community at the building, she said that there is a great sense of community within the building – now and historically. She said that because of the courtyard design facing toward interior, socializing was accommodated.

Mr. Murdock provided context of the neighborhood and site. He said the area on the west slope of Capitol Hill was on the streetcar line and was filled with smaller apartment buildings, residential and small commercial buildings. He said the building was built in 1924, design by Charles L Haynes.

He said the style is semi-Gothic in materials and symmetry. He said most courtyards open to the street and function as entry portal; he found no other example of courtyard in back. He said windows have been replaced with vinyl. He said the stacked-up elements, exterior stairs, u-shape plan are still there. He said there are ten apartments on each floor and four in the daylight basement. He noted all apartments are accessed from courtyard. He said the integrity of the courtyard is intact.

Mr. Murdock noted area comparables: Victoria Apartments on Queen Anne which, he said, is different because there is a corridor in the building and the courtyard is an entrance courtyard; Anhalt Apartments which is single apartment in width, individual stairs – townhouses, and corner shared stairs; and Tudor Manor which is similar, but the courtyard faces the street.

He shared a video tour of the building which provided an experience of processing through the building and grounds. He noted courtyard landscape details and said Aaron Luoma walked through plantings (letter in DON file). A Chinese Photinia is one of the largest in the City; Japanese Camelia is possibly original.

Mr. Murdock said architect Charles L. Haynes has a diverse body of high-quality work including the Butterworth Mortuary, Narada Apartments, and Donahoe Garage. He said the building meets criteria D, E, and F. He said it is a remarkable 1920's apartment building and a remarkable work of Charles L. Haynes. He said it is a distinct building in a dense neighborhood and takes up the entire block on Bellevue.

Mr. Coney asked about interior.

Mr. Murdock said that while the Murphy beds may be gone, those rooms are usable as offices or storage. He said the floor plan is unique in the City and properties of this type. He said that some units above the corridor have two bedrooms.

Ms. Barker asked how common dining rooms are in apartment buildings.

Mr. Murdock said the building was designed more like a higher-end apartment, formal in layout with distinct dining and living rooms and bedrooms.

Ms. Woo said it is uncommon.

Ms. Barker asked if having a dining room elevated it to a higher living level.

Ms. Woo said yes.

#### Owner Presentation

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill Leary, thanked the co-nominators and said the owners support nomination of the exterior, site and courtyard. He said they have been good stewards of the building.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, provided information on the condition of the property. She said the garages along the alley are under the courtyard and have suffered moisture intrusion and lateral stress; there is spalling rebar and rusty joints. She said without addressing, it will continue to degrade. She noted membrane roof condition. She said structural analysis is needed to mitigate structural problems.

She said the building has integrity and probably meets standards for designation. She said the garages were permitted separately and is not unusual. She said the garages were not part of the original design. She said windows have been replaced, additional plantings and signage added. She said the general layout of the garden is similar. She said in the breezeway there have been repairs to the entry tile. She said there has been infill screen at the top of the gate. She said the garden and paths and paving under pergolas remain, but the pergolas are gone. She said the fountain is not original although it is similar in shape. She said the mural at the entry is gone and the garage doors are non-original. She noted interior alterations: washer and dryers, wallpaper, electric ranges, ironing boards, light fixtures, heaters and radiators, tile and marble, drywall installed, carpeting. She said the height of the stair rails are not to Code. She said French doors, swing doors, refrigerators, Murphy beds are gone. She said the building does not meet criteria A, B, or C. Regarding D, she said the Tudor Revival style building retains its applied ornament, quatrefoil, shaped parapet, patterned brick. She said the orientation of the garden courtyard was unique. She said other landmarked apartment buildings that had interiors designated had higher level and quality of materials, entry vestibules, lobbies and stairs and noted the Delamar, Maryland, and San Remo apartment buildings as examples. She said the interiors here don't contribute as much and are not distinctive. She said the building typology

can be read. She said that Haynes' work here is significant, Malmo and Pederson's contributions are not.

Mr. Morrison supported the Staff Report. He noted concern about inclusion of interior space and noted the function and modest-ness of this building compared to others that have been designated. He asked that interiors not be included.

Mr. Freitas asked if the garage originally had doors.

Ms. Mirro said yes.

Ms. Doherty said it was probably a hinged door.

Ms. Barker asked about additions to gates.

Ms. Mirro said only mesh was added; the top infill was artisan designed.

Ms. Barker said the top matches the rest.

Ms. Mirro said it is all original, jus the mesh was added.

Mr. Chalana asked about the railing and guard rails that are too short.

Ms. Mirro said the Code requirements came later.

Ms. Barker said the board has seen this a lot in schools.

Public Comment:

Aaron Luoma, landscape architect, said that Malmo was a pioneer in scale and mass production of plants as well as providing design services. He said Malmo was a forerunner of all – scale, production of plants, availability of plants and services to everyday people. He said that 'shrubbing it up' is design and you had to know difference in plantings to design that. He supported designation, agreeing with the Staff Report and Malmo's significance.

Haley Lavka supported designation and read from the Staff Report.

Ranita Patel supported designation. She said the exterior is captivating and noted the building is visible from the Space Needle. She said it is a cornerstone of the neighborhood and its designation has the support of the community. She said the interior is unique and changes have not taken away from that. She said the units are well-ventilated with windows in all cardinal directions. She said there is lots of natural light. She said it is not fancy. She supported designation of all areas of the building.

Jake MacGraw supported designation of all areas and noted he is a building resident. He supported inclusion of interior and said the courtyard speaks for itself. He said it is hard to find livable space and this is like a home. He said it is hard to find community space with open-ness. He said the interior is so open and accessible.

Mary Barnes, tenant, supported designation and said she echoed earlier public comment. She said the building is distinctive and she noted that every unit overlooks and has access to the courtyard space.

Jordan Kowalski, tenant, supported designation, including the interior. He said a dining room is a rarity in apartments. He said he has room mates to afford living there. He said they can see the courtyard from the apartment; the courtyard is a big part of the experience of living there.

Allie Barnes supported designation of all areas of the building. She noted the courtyard, dining rooms, and great ventilation.

Noah Greene supported designation of all areas. He said the garden is spectacular and there is nothing else like it. He noted the quality of the interior, the volume of space that goes from one side of exterior to the other. He noted the layout, ventilation, light, and spatial volume are special.

Nicole Sellis supported designation and noted Criterion F; she said people instantly know the building, courtyard and fountain.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Freitas supported designation on criteria D and E and noted the great adaptation of Garden Style apartment. He noted the response to the site, flipping the layout and turning its back on the street. He said he walked through the gallery and noted an old Camelia and said it was a remarkable experience. He said he wished there was a planting plan for the courtyard but noted the circulation and spatial elements are all there. He noted the topography and said views were compromised with growing plants, but it has the integrity to speak to the original intent. He noted the courtyard relationship to the building. He supported the Staff Report.

Mr. Coney supported designation and said the building has always stood out. He noted the flipped courtyard. He commented on the spacious apartment units and that architecture is more than the exterior of building, walls, paint; it is the layout. He said the building is known for its unique layout – dining rooms, to get away from the stigma of apartment living. He said the layout is unique and noted the front to City orientation of units, the feng shui that includes the garden in all units. He said the building should be preserved as part of heritage of the City and supported criteria D, F and would not be opposed to E. He to include interior layout, 1, 2, 3 and if they want to move a wall, they can do a Certificate of Approval.

Mr. Chalana supported designation and supported the Staff Report – criterion D, F and E. He said the apartment building is lived-in and retains that quality. He said the alterations don't take away from it. He said the interior should be retained in some way and he noted the important relationship between the building and courtyard. He said changes can all be undone – they are minor things; the bones are there. He supported designation of exterior, courtyard, interior volume and spatial layout.

Mr. Guo supported designation on criteria D, F and E and to include site, exterior, and interior. He noted the concept for interior space spanning both sides that allows for daylighting is unique.



Ms. Johnson supported designation on D, E, and F. She said there are a lot of buildings this age; this is unique. She said that design can create and promote community. She did not support designation of interiors but understood the desire to landmark the walls. She said the building was built for middle class families. She said including interiors would be over-reach. She said that the layout is special but structurally it is unlikely that it would change.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation and noted the reverse courtyard and central arcade. He said it is a stretch to preserve unit footprints and noted the great spaces.

Ms. Barker supported designation based on the Staff Report, criteria D, E, and F. She said on the tour she was impressed by the quality and integrity outside and in, including the walkway in the basement. She said everything is in great shape. She said she was blown away when she walked in to unit and noted the light that flowed in from the garden to front. She said the courtyard is magical and feels like the living room of the complex. She said the building is unique with the exterior entrances. She said the unit felt much larger than it was. She noted the dining room and interior layout. She said five board members support inclusion of interior to preserve architectural and spatial layouts, and daylighting into rooms and that one more vote was needed.

Ms. Johnson said you get a sense of history when walking into the space; including the interior is overreach.

Mr. Coney said a Certificate of Approval would be needed to move walls, designation doesn't mean they can't do it. He said it would preserve architecture of the building - how a family used the spaces. He noted the Murphy bed.

Mr. Freitas said the daylighting, air, and views are character defining aspects of the spaces and volumes and are tied to the architectural significance. He said the building meets Criterion D as part of Garden Apartment type; he said it is an exceptional aspect and all the more reason to include it. He noted the views, air, and light.

Mr. Chalana said the interiors are important here otherwise it is just the façade and doesn't make sense. He said not including the interiors takes away from the entire purpose of the apartment courtyard. He said even if it is overreach, we need to preserve some in entirety for serving the public. The courtyard is public and there could be public value in interiors.

Ms. Barker said she hated overreach and precedent setting but what makes this meet Criterion D is there are no internal hallways – all units have access to two sides; each unit has visual quality that supports the method of construction – the lack of internal hallway. She said designation is not overreaching.

Mr. Coney said it doesn't restrict owner.

Ms. Barker said there is no line in the sand, there is a way to get from A to B.

Mr. Coney said there is a feng shui to the building; it is an unprecedented layout.

Ms. Johnson said with the exterior controlled, the stairs stay where they are.

Mr. Hodgins said you can't say you are against development; he didn't support inclusion of interior.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Roy Vue Apartments at 615 Bellevue Avenue East as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site; the exterior of the apartment building including the central arcade; and the courtyard and elevated garden spaces.

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

**112118.4            NOMINATION**

112118.41            Shearwater Community Center / Decatur Annex  
7725 43rd Avenue NE

Nominators Presentation:

Ruth Fruland and Cynthia Mejia-Giudici prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file).

Dr. Fruland provided context of the site and neighborhood. She said site and buildings were annexed by the school district in 1959. She said the buildings are the last bits of the Shearwater Housing Project that was built for Navy families by the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA). She noted the project was unique for the peaceful racial integration of workplaces, housing, schools and community center. She said the Sand Point Naval Air Station drove the Wedgewood neighborhood's growth.

She said the original 1945 building has integrity and can convey its significance via signage and educational materials. She said the original windows were wood, painted green. She said the interior sashes were replaced with white vinyl. She noted on the east section, east end, north side, the transom, above-grade door with no steps, and cedar board siding. She said the boiler room has brick painted white and louvers above door; she noted the bricked-in window. On the west section, she said the windows are boarded up; she noted the electrical box, conduit, wood frame was retained and there are new vinyl windows. She said the original entrances are distinctive and still have original doors and windows. She noted a bank of windows on the other side.

Dr. Fruland said the building meets criteria A, and C. She said it is associated with Sand Point Naval Air Station and with the development of Wedgewood. She noted the housing was multicultural in general and she noted the Filipino culture. She noted the integration of Navy in neighborhoods and public schools from 1940 – 1960 and the proximity to Sand Point NAS. She reported that Christopher Sargent was convinced integration of the Navy would build a more efficient Navy. She said under Jesse Epstein, the SHA was dedicated to integration, non-discrimination and racial

equality. She said the Navy contracted with SHA to build and manage Shearwater. She said the building would also meet Criterion F.

Ms. Mejia-Giudici said she lived in the project from 1956-62; the base closed in 1960. She said in 1959 the US Navy gave land to build a school. She said there were 315 units – lots of families and it was diverse with Japanese, Filipinos, Native Americans, Caucasians. She said there were parties in the main hall and she enjoyed a diverse upbringing. She said her father came here and was Chief Petty Officer. She noted there were a lot of Catholics and they attended many baptisms, birthdays. She said the west end building had a laundromat and they practiced judo there. She said at the east end you could borrow garden tools. She said they took great pride in the area. She said there were forces who wanted to get rid of the buildings and them. She said it was a tribute to the Navy to work toward abolishing discrimination in the armed forces. She said the building represents a unique history and was the heart of the community. She said her mom sold popsicles and learned Tagalog from a Filipina hair stylist. She said they attended Sand Point community events. She said she didn't know discrimination until the projects were demolished. She said her mom bought their house, which was abandoned, in 1962. She said it was remarkable in the north end. She said 1969-70 someone egged and BB-gunned their house. She said she still lives in the neighborhood and her mother still pines for the PX Commissary. She said it was a unique multicultural neighborhood in Wedgewood. She said their experiences should not be forgotten – it was a lived history of her father and her family. She said there are many stories about the community. She wants to preserve the cultural significance.

Dr. Fruland went over redlining map and explained it is impossible to understand the radical nature of what happened during and after WWII in Seattle and Wedgwood without knowing about the rules of systemic racial discrimination before 1940. The Great Depression created the opportunity to change some of the rules.

She reported that the US Housing Act became law in 1937 with its stated purpose to create a Housing Authority to work toward the elimination of unsafe and unsanitary housing conditions, for the eradication of slums, for the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity. She said that racial equity was not mentioned, and implementation was given to local city governments. This meant that discrimination on the basis of race could be continued. And it was, except in the Northwest, and Seattle in particular, even in spite of laws that perpetrated segregation.

Dr. Fruland said in the 1930's there were maps and reports created by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC), including for Seattle in 1936, which used the color "red" to designate neighborhoods that were considered too "hazardous" to provide home loans to the people living there because they were people of color (Blacks, Filipinos, Hispanics, etc.). The result of this policy guaranteed that there were no investments, no improvement in living conditions, and therefore, no subsequent increase in wealth in black and minority neighborhoods. Redlining was not officially declared "unlawful" until the Fair Housing Act of 1968 was passed. If people of color could not get loans to invest in their own neighborhoods, neither could they simply move to other communities.

Dr. Fruland said that sundown laws required people of color to be in their own community by sunset or be arrested. She said a common practice with regard to housing was to enact racial covenants that kept non-white residents from living outside areas of central Seattle and other poor neighborhoods. From a covenant for View Ridge Sand Point Country Club, an exclusive neighborhood between Wedgwood and Sand Point: *No tract shall be sold, conveyed, rented or leased, in whole or in part, to any **Hebrew or to any person of the Malay, Ethiopian or any other negro or any Asiatic race**; or any descendant of any thereof, except only employees in the domestic service on [the] premises of persons qualifies as herein provided as occupants.*

Board Questions:

Mr. Freitas asked if the Navy and SHA had non-discrimination policies.

Dr. Fruland said only SHA had determined and implemented policies; the Navy tried different experiments.

Ms. Mejia- Giudici said Filipinos were granted citizenship in 1941.

Dr. Fruland said if you were black it took longer and were in separate units. She said it was contentious during the war. She said the Navy didn't discriminate; the Navy was integrated so housing was for all.

Dr. Fruland said there were only a few integrated housing projects for military, but SHA had integrated housing all over the City.

Ms. Hodgins asked if buildings were joined as one.

Ms. Mejia-Giudici said the three sections make up a long contiguous space with laundry to the west, community hall and kitchen in the middle and administrative building and storage to the east.

Mr. Freitas asked when the housing was removed.

Ms. Mejia-Giudici said it was removed in 1965 and the bidder was given 90 days to raze all the buildings. She said these buildings were mad part of the school district.

Dr. Fruland said the housing was temporary and substandard.

Ms. Barker asked about housing related to site.

Dr. Fruland said the housing was around this site.

Mr. Guo said regarding Filipino American history the Navy was important to the community. He said Filipino was the second largest Asian group in Seattle; the same was happening at Fort Lawton.

Mr. Chalana asked about the Filipino Association.

Ms. Mejia-Giudici said that everyone went to the parties and used the community center. Responding to questions she said the significant tree was identified under SEPA.

Ms. Doherty said that SDCI has not yet issued a demolition permit. She said that Seattle Public Schools submitted an Appendix A to the Historic Preservation program under SEPA, but the community members submitted a nomination application. She noted that the site plan was from the Appendix A document prepared by the Johnson Partnership on behalf of SPS.

Owner's Presentation:

Rich Hill, McCullough Hill Leary, said the tree will be preserved per SEPA condition. He said a demolition permit was not issued. He said the School District plans to replace the building with play area and open space lawn.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, went over the National Park Service's Seven Aspects of Integrity and noted there have been substantial changes to the building: 1960 addition, transoms removed, vinyl windows added, door infilled, ramps added, aluminum windows added, door openings cut in, and siding is infested with insects. She said there aren't a lot of original walls inside; in 1965 walls were demolished and some were added to accommodate change of program. She noted poor workmanship on the interior – bouncy and patched floors, and problems with mold. She said the construction was below-standard. She said the feeling of WWII is not in evidence, so Criterion C would not apply in that way. She said the building did not meet any of the criteria for designation. She said the building is a remnant, not an embodiment and without the surrounding housing it is difficult to show the association. She said there are other housing projects that are better examples: Yesler Terrace, Rainier Vista, High Point, Holly Park. She presented maps depicting racial integration percentages in Seattle in 1940, 1950 and 1960 and said this project had no lasting impact.

Mr. Hodgins said that the numbers are needed to accurately compare.

Ms. Mirro said that the building can't convey what it was; the workmanship was poor and it has not stood the test of time.

Mr. Hill said SPS appreciates the nomination and seeks denial from the board. He said the building does not meet the criteria and they are awaiting approval of demolition. He said that Tom Quackenbush from DON concurred with that. There is no historic integrity and the building went through the SEPA process. He said SPS will install a plaque commemorating this history that is important to the community at the site.

Ms. Mirro said that there were 715 units of housing at High Point.

Mr. Hodgins asked how it related to the larger tract.

Ms. Mirro said Wedgwood was near a school, and Navy / military.

Ms. Johnson asked if Sand Point has any housing of this era.

Ms. Doherty said that some was related to WWII and earlier; some small officer housing and rest was multi-unit development / barracks.

Ms. Barker asked about the west windows.

Ms. Mirro said they were removed.

Ms. Barker asked who appealed SEPA.

Mr. Hill said appellants included Chris Jackins, Save Our Schools.

Public Comment:

Valerie Bunn, local historian, spoke in support of nomination. She said that 315 buildings were in the Shearwater project. Within this site are now two schools. In 1961 there were still barracks; they were torn down to build Decatur School. She said there are very few landmarked buildings in North Seattle. She said the building meets Criterion C and conveys the significance of the development of the neighborhood, association with WWII, and post war development. She said Wedgwood was built by a private developer.

Elizabeth Lunney, neighbor, who used to live in military housing. She did not support nomination and said the building is of poor quality and has no integrity. She said it is not significant in history. She said the stories are important but can be reflected elsewhere. She said that Shearwater Annex is a footnote; there were more than 8000 units of racially integrated housing in Seattle and only 315 here. She said racial integration of the Navy was a long and slow process; it was not a single point decision and Shearwater didn't play a significant role in this. She said there was still segregation at the Sand Point Naval Air Station.

Larry Gill spoke in support of nomination and noted that some things are more important, like cultural and historical significance that exists here. He said it is incredibly important. He said MOHAI had an exhibit on the impact of WWII. He said these are stories that need to be told.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Chalana did not support nomination and said the context was altered and alone the building can't convey significance or story. He said the building did not have much impact on racial integration.

Mr. Guo supported nomination and said it is part of a larger community. The northeast part of the city was military-centric. He said there is some significance but wanted to see more supporting information.

Ms. Johnson said the story is important – the association with military and integration. She said the community center is interesting, but the association is not close or significant enough. She didn't support nomination citing integrity issues and lack of context. She said the building doesn't tell story as much as a plaque would.

Mr. Hodgins said he lives in the northeast and this building – which is not a school building – doesn't make sense. He always wondered about its story and said that being off the beaten path is not the fault of the building. He said there are some integrity issues but there is enough there to recognize there is a story and he would be glad to hear it. He said this has nothing to do with architecture – it is more about Criterion C – the story and history of military housing off base. He said he leaned toward supporting nomination.

Mr. Freitas said it was difficult; he said he supported nomination, but it was not a slam dunk. He said that historic preservation is available to anyone; a community can identify places as important. He appreciated the community taking this on. He said the nominator needs to tell the story clearly about integration by the City (SHA) and by the Navy.

Mr. Coney said the condition is not an issue. He said the relationship, story of integration, SHA connection is significant. He said the nominator needs to make a case for that. He said there are better examples elsewhere, e.g. Yesler Terrace, but that he would reluctantly support nomination.

Ms. Barker said she was a Navy brat and lived in military housing. She supported nomination. She said the building screams out, 'something happened here'; the building is still there. She said the building is white with green trim; the military had gray or white. This was dependents' housing, a community set-up. She asked for more information about the relationships, timing.

Mr. Hodgins said the structure is a remnant, but the community center was a place of unity.

Ms. Johnson said she would like to see examples of other military housing community centers.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Shearwater Community Center at 7725 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE 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 and the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for January 2, 2019; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RC/GH            5:2:0    Motion carried. Mr. Chalana and Ms. Johnson opposed.

**112118.5            CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

112118.51            University of Washington Parrington Hall  
4105 Memorial Drive NE

Ms. Doherty reviewed the signed Controls and Incentives document.

Mr. Freitas said that C is not normal.

Ms. Doherty said the language was borrowed form Sand Point Guidelines; it doesn't apply to trees. She said that 30' from the base of the building captures the entry stair.

Mr. Freitas said it is odd criteria, it is not a native plant garden.

Ms. Doherty said it is not typical language; UW asked for it. The landscape has been altered.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for University of Washington Parrington Hall, 4105 Memorial Drive NE.

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

112118.52 American Meter & Appliance Building / Frederick Boyd & Co.  
1001-1005 Westlake Avenue North  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a four-month extension. They looked at adding a hotel to the top; they are at a transitional phase and need more time. She said Sarah Sodt thought the request was reasonable.

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

**112118.6 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator