MINUTES
Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday May 16, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present
Deb Barker
Manish Chalana
Russell Coney
Kathleen Durham
Rich Freitas
Garrett Hodgins
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Julianne Patterson
Steven Treffers

Absent
Nicole McKernan

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

051618.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
April 4, 2018

051618.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL
Sarah Highfield explained that a new tenant, the Mexican Consulate, was moving in. She said two signs will be installed: on the north elevation a curved face consulate seal will be attached into the grout; on the west elevation a flat profile consulate seal will be installed at entry. A flag pole will be attached into the ground. Lighting for flag pole and signs will be in ground connected to existing electrical. A small gate and railing will be installed at the stairs to match existing railing. On the south façade two small rectangular mechanical shrouds for HVAC will be installed.

Ms. Barker asked about the razor wire.

Ms. Highfield said it was there, it was exposed after removal of vegetation and is part of adjacent property.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Patterson said the Harvard Belmont review committee walked the site; the changes are minor, and the shrouds are not visible from the sidewalk.

Ms. Barker said the work is progressing well and it is nice to see the improvements.

Mr. Kiel said attachment is in the mortar.

Mr. Treffers said it is reasonable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for installation of signage, installation of a flag pole with lighting, installation of a gate, installation of tow vent shrouds.

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

District ordinance
The proposed landscaping plans as presented May 16, 2018 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
C. INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS
1. Additions or renovations
Guideline: Additions should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is being preserved.

4. Fences and Walls:
Guideline: If fencing is required, low fences are encouraged especially in front yards to maintain the existing openness of the district.
Guideline: Fencing and wall materials shall be consistent with the district.

D. SIGNS
Guideline: Keep signs relatively small and subordinate to the building. Signs that flash, blink, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion, or signs that vary in intensity shall not be permitted.
Sign lighting should be subdued, incandescent and front-lit from the exterior rather than back-lit of the fluorescent type. Signs shall be designed to minimize glare on existing buildings.

Commercial Buildings: Signs should fit within the existing features of the facade. Flush mounted signs are encouraged.

Low signs are recommended. If signs must be placed on buildings, limit them to small identification panels at the entrances.

Wood and metal are the preferred materials for signs in residential areas. Signs should not be made of plastic materials.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

MM/SC/DB/GH  
10:0:0    Motion carried.

051618.22   Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District / Right-of-Way
Vicinity of 6831 62nd Avenue NE
Proposed paving of parking strip for bus stop

Kate Elliot, King County Metro, explained bus route change necessitates three concrete landing pads in the existing parking strip to make the bus stop fully accessible. The concrete pads will line up with bus doors.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Doherty said the SPARC thought the change was reasonable and there is no change to character defining features.

Mr. Coney concurred.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site improvements in the right-of-way, near 6831 62nd Avenue NE.

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

Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

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

Relevant District Guidelines for:

**BUILDING SITES & DISTRICT SETTING**

New Landscape or Site Features
- New landscape features or site features should not radically change, obscure or destroy primary elevations, character-defining features, nearby materials or finishes.
- New site features should be clearly differentiated from historic site features such that character-defining features are not diminished or a false historic appearance created. All new site work should be designed in character with the historic building and be based on established design elements and materials.

New Street Work & Sidewalks
- New or in-kind replacement sidewalk areas must match the appearance of the existing sidewalk surfaces throughout the district in material and design.
- New concrete work must be specified to match aggregate size, color, and proportion of different aggregate mixes.
- New concrete work must be specified to incorporate colorant as necessary to match the existing/historic adjacent concrete color.

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

MM/SC/ST/JP 10:0:0 Motion carried.

051618.23 Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District / Building 331
6610 62nd Ave NE
Proposed removal of trees for below grade sewer repairs

Roger Tucker, Environmental Works, explained renovations being done for three youth homes. All sewer laterals are original and in poor condition; tree roots have made it worse. He said the trees need to be removed and sewer laterals replaced.

Shannon Carrico, Environmental Works, indicated trees to be removed and said they are non-native, invasive species; an arborist report was provided. She said there will be no impact to other trees. She said they have no plans to replant to avoid future sewer line problems.

Mr. Freitas asked if they are historic trees and if replacement in kind was required.
Ms. Doherty said SPARC reviewed; the trees were there for a while, but we don’t know how long. She said she asked them to look at using an air spade, but there is no way to save the trees because the sewer line is directly below the root base. She said that two members of the public attended the SPARC review and showed support. In response to question of feasibility of moving the sewer line, it was noted the line needs to be where it is because it is tied to existing bathrooms and kitchens. She said that SPARC found the proposal reasonable and that replanting would create the same problem. She said SPARC thought it was unfortunate, the trees were originally planted too close to the house and it is reasonable to remove them.

Ms. Carrico said multiple parts are coming up and there is decay.

Mr. Freitas said he understood but recommended a more appropriate site be identified for new planting.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed tree removal at 6610 62nd Avenue NE, as per the attached submittal.

1. The proposed removal of landscaping will change the appearance of Building 331, but should not adversely affect the landscape features as specified in Ordinance No. 124850.

2. The applicant has demonstrated that they cannot perform the utility repairs and preserve the trees. The applicant has also determined that the trees are negatively impacting the sewer line.

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

MM/SC/KJ/GH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

051618.24 E.C. Hughes School
7740 34th Avenue SW
Proposed site improvements for playground

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Gretchen DeDecker explained that the Roxhill School program is moving to E. C. Hughes; the playground will be redone. The Friends of Roxhill School initiated the project to install new playground equipment in existing play area behind the building.

Ms. Doherty said it is very small and some site improvements – addition of curb and seating wall – will be done.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Coney said it is a vast of improvement to the oasis of asphalt. He said he is glad to see the improvement.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site improvements at E.C. Hughes Elementary School, 7740 34th Avenue SW, as per the attached submittal.
This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 433/15) as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

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

MM/SC/GH/JP 9:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Benton’s Jewelers Street Clock
3216 NE 45th Street
Proposed removal and storage during a construction project

Ms. Doherty explained ARC reviewed the simple proposal to remove and store the clock in a licensed and bonded facility. She said the clock was originally in the University District and was moved. Aegis Living is aggregating some parcels for a new building there; they purchased the clock and plan to reinstall it when the new building is complete. She said the clock is currently in the right-of-way; it will be removed and stored in Spring 2019 and will be reinstalled in October 2021 at its new site. She said they are exploring two locations and will come back for a Certificate of Approval for reinstallation / placement. She said they are getting bids to restore the clock.

Ms. Patterson asked is there a process to guarantee the clock will come back.

Ms. Doherty said they are committed to bringing it back.

Ms. Sodt noted a similar course of action on the Dexter Street Clock.

Mr. Treffers asked about site design.

Ms. Doherty said that the original report refers to the location the clock was on but the clock has moved since designation.

Ms. Barker said that it is blocked by street trees now.

Ms. Doherty said their plan is to make it more visible when reinstalling it.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed de-installation and storage of the Benton’s Jewelers Street Clock, 3216 NE 45th Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed temporary removal and clock storage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 17/81) as the proposed
work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the landmark, and the street clock will be returned to the property for re-installation.

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

MM/SC/RC/KJ 10:0:0  Motion carried.

Alexis Hotel Block/First Avenue Group
1007 First Avenue
Proposed painting, and alterations to hotel entry.

Kevin Terra, Awbrey Cook Rogers McGill Architects, said the project involves repainting previously painted portions of the building, switching out the entry doors and recladding the existing awning.

Ms. Sodt said the proposal was reviewed at the ARC, and the felt the canopy was a good direction and provided feedback on the painting.

Jenne Oxford, Kimpton Seattle, said they were able to confirm what has been previously painted. She provided elevations and material/paint samples. She said the entry will be relocated and doors will be glass. She provided detail on how they will infill where the flag poles are.

Mr. Coney asked if they had tested colors and cleaning.

The applicants said the building will be cleaned and a graffiti coat applied.

Ms. Sodt said to contact her with proposed cleaning method.

Ms. Coney appreciated all the work to determine what was and wasn’t painted.

Mr. Kiel noted their good work.

Ms. Barker appreciated the proposed work. She said ARC gave direction and the applicants confirmed what was and wasn’t painted.

Mr. Kiel said they are recladding a non-original canopy at a non-original entry. He had no problem with what was proposed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 111058, as the changes 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.
Volunteer Park
1400 East Prospect Street
Proposed fencing around the lily ponds

Brooks Kolb, Volunteer Park Trust, explained there was an unobstructed view when first designed in 1913; he noted that safety issues / concerns arose almost immediately. A mesh netting was installed in the pond to catch people – it was not ideal. In 2010 a neighborhood resident raised safety concerns again but funds to build fence were not raised; in 2017 an adult drowned there. He said a DON grant was obtained to raise funds. He showed existing conditions – inner and outer curb. He said the proposed design brings the fence forward; it stands 27” above the curb and 31” above the walking surface. He noted concerns that the fence could obstruct views into the pond. He said they propose a height of 24 – 28”; material will be ½” x 1” wrought iron flat bars bolted into the back of the outer curb. He said the temporary ramps will be put in to allow ducklings access in/out during season. Finish is black satin.

Mr. Chalana asked the depth of the pond.

Mr. Kolb said it is 30 – 36”. Responding to questions from Mr. Chalana he said they researched Olmsted fencing at other sites. He said they chose the curving tops because they are friendlier than the period pickets.

Mr. Chalana expressed concern for the potential adverse impacts to the ducks.

Mr. Kolb said the picket spacing allows ducklings to walk through. He said the hedges will remain, they are just adding the fence. Responding to Mr. Freitas he said the hedges are about 30” tall and are maintained.

Mr. Treffers asked when the outer curb was added.

Mr. Kolb said 2003.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Coney said ARC appreciated the quality of material and that attachment of fence will be to inside edge of outer curb. He said one portion is a gate for access.

Mr. Kolb said that each pond will have one 3’ wide gate that opens out; hinge will be subtle.

Ms. Johnson said addition of a second curb and shrubs was a major change – more than addition of a fence. She said safety-wise, it is important.

Mr. Treffers said the fence will be installed into non-original materials and is reversible.

Mr. Freitas said there is opportunity to do something different like choose another species of hedge. He said for 117 years there was no issue.
Mr. Hodgins noted the material is substantial and said a mock up would have been nice to see.

Ms. Doherty said she is hearing that board members prefer a lighter touch with thinner, smaller components. Board members indicated agreement.

Mr. Chalana said the damage was already done. He noted the safety aspect and said if there is potential to lighten it up, to use thin members as possible.

Board members were OK with smooth surface and satin finish.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed fencing at Volunteer Park, 1400 East Prospect Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 125215 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

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

MM/SC/GH/JP 10:0:0 Motion carried.

051618.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

051618.31 Broad Street Substation
319 6th Avenue North

Ms. Doherty explained the Controls and Incentives agreement. She said it includes specific language to assure that Seattle City Light can always maintain electrical utility.

Mr. Treffers said it makes sense to have the specific language included.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the Broad Street Substation, 319 6th Avenue North.

MM/SC/JP/GH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

051618.4 DESIGNATIONS

051618.41 Francis Skinner Edris Nurses Home
2120 1st Avenue North
Brian Regan, Arbor Space LLC, presented the nomination report (in DON file). This highly intact building, of the Colonial-Georgian Revival style, was originally the nurses' home for Children’s Orthopedic Hospital on top of Queen Anne Hill. At that time, most nurses were young single women, and hospitals customarily provided group housing for them. The initial nurses' home was the Fresh Air Cottage, the hospital's first structure, built in 1908. It was razed; and this building constructed in 1923.

He said that the Queen Anne Manor, adjacent to the subject building on the east, was the former home of the historic Seattle Children’s Orthopedic Hospital, (COH), built originally in 1907 by the Women’s Hospital Association to provide medical care to children regardless of their ability to pay. They first opened a ward at Seattle General Hospital on First Hill, but in 1908 they opened the Fresh Air Cottage on this block. They sought a Queen Anne site because it was among the highest points in the city and thus was felt to have the healthiest air. A three-story, 27-bed hospital was built in 1911, designed by Somerville and Cote. A fourth floor was added in 1921, expanding capacity to 78 beds. In 1928 the entire facility was re-designed by A. H. Albertson, with a new wing with glazed terra cotta tile and an arched entrance portico on Warren Avenue North. The original Fresh Air Cottage was razed at this time.

Mr. Regan cited “Hope on the Hill” by Walt Crowley and David Wilma: “In the spring of 1898, a 5-year-old Seattle boy named Willis Clise suffered and eventually died of what was called “inflammatory rheumatism.” There was no treatment, and no doctor west of Philadelphia who specialized in childhood ailments. Willis’s mother, Anna Clise, embarked on a mission to create an association dedicated to providing surgical and other hospital care to children, regardless of class, race, or ability to pay.” She organized a board of like-minded Seattle women and in 1908 opened an eight-bed treatment and recovery facility. Today Seattle Children’s is a regional medical center, a leader in pediatric medicine research, and is consistently ranked among the top 10 children’s hospitals in the nation.

He said that the Colonial-Georgian Revival style reflects the late-19th-century fascination with homes built by the early English and Dutch settlers, an affection that intensified through the World War I and II years before peaking in the mid-1950s. Colonial Revival is essentially a mixture of styles, all uniquely American. Colonial Revival sought to follow American colonial architecture of the period around the Revolutionary War, which drew strongly from Georgian architecture of Great Britain.

He said the present physical appearance and characteristics of the building exterior are essentially unchanged from the original. The rectangular building is concrete frame construction with mostly red brick cladding; and with some stucco and tan-colored terracotta accents. The cornice is of terracotta in a leaf pattern with a twisted band below. A second terracotta course runs between the second and third stories, with an egg-and-tongue pattern and a twisted band below. The entry is toward the north end of the west façade, with a flat-roofed concrete porch approached by several steps from the north side. The porch roof is supported by two groups of turned wood posts and thin square columns with capitolts. The door itself is oak with leaded glass and is flanked by eight-light sidelights. Most windows are six-over-six with double-hung wood sash; a group of four windows is just north of the entry on the first and second floors feature turned wood trim.

Mr. Regan said the roof is hipped and clay-tiled. From the north end of the roof, there are two intact brick chimneys serving the extant wood-burning fireplaces on the floors.
below. Also present are some cupolas or other vents, possibly covered with weathered copper. The outside edge of the roof is lined with copper gutters leading to scuppers, collector boxes and rain leaders, all of which may be the originals, if only in form and location based on the original elevations. These need some repair and/or cleaning based on water leaking from them onto the adjacent masonry.

He said to the south of the front entry on the west façade is a three-sided bay on the first and second stories which is clad with stucco and has three six-over-six windows on each floor. Between the windows are turned mullions, similar to the turned pieces at the entry. The rear (east) side has another entry porch with a shed roof supported by two pairs of square columns. The north elevation, on Boston Street, has a narrow drive down to a garage door opening to the daylight basement, now used as a secondary entry. Windows on the rear and both end elevations are primarily six-over-six, with turned mullions on the first floor. The daylight basement level is clad with stucco and also has six-over-six windows.

Mr. Regan said that almost all windows seem to be original wood frame, single pane, with the exception of some in the basement that were apparently replaced in the 1968 remodel plan. The window above the south side exterior door was recently replaced with a steel frame window after some water leakage. Interior changes were made to accommodate use by American Cancer Society.

Architect A. H. Albertson who designed the subject Nurses’ Home, and redesigned and expanded the COH building, was one of Seattle’s most prominent architects. Among Albertson’s best-known works are the Northern Life (now Seattle) Tower, the downtown YMCA and St. Joseph’s Church and Cornish School. Other work on Queen Anne includes the Mrs. Grant Smith residence at 619 W. Comstock Street (a designated landmark) and St. Anne’s Convent. In 1939 Albertson joined the state office of the Federal Housing Administration, retiring as its chief architect in 1949.

Mr. Hodgins asked if the hospital had owned the whole block.

Mr. Regan said not at the time. He said the neighbors opposed the Fresh Air House because they thought it would bring disease; they thought patients should go to the Pest House on Beacon Hill instead.

Ms. Durham asked about other nurse accommodations in Seattle.

Mr. Regan said he couldn’t find anything but noted the Catholic Church has been doing it for centuries, housing nuns who were running hospitals.

Ms. Patterson asked why the method of construction was chosen.

Mr. Regan couldn’t find any information. He said the roof, walls, and floor are all concrete. He said it is hard to prove it is unique.

Ms. Doherty said that historic plan books in the teens and 1920s showed concrete houses with concrete gabled roofs; they were desirable for permanence and fire protection.

Ms. Johnson said the Ballard Locks buildings are entirely concrete.
Mr. Chalana asked if the construction is unreinforced.

Mr. Regan assumes the building is reinforced; they wanted to build something permanent.

Mr. Coney asked about tenant improvements.

Mr. Regan said the American Cancer Society currently occupies the building and did lots of interior work; all wiring is surface mounted. He said the bay window wall is concrete with stucco.

Mr. Freitas asked if rear landscaped area shown in the croquet photo is still there.

Mr. Regan said no, not really; it is extended further back then. He said other buildings have been added.

Mr. Freitas noted how the women were using the space for recreation.

Mr. Regan said there are rumors about an underground tunnel and a back entrance/exit to hospital.

Mr. Chalana asked how long the building was used as a nurses’ home.

Mr. Regan said from 1923 – 1957.

Mr. Chalana asked if there are any oral histories from the nurses that worked there – it would be great to have that.

Ms. Doherty said the Queen Anne Historical Society would likely know about those if they existed; Michael Herschensohn has done his own research. She said that just the building exterior and a portion of the site was nominated. She provided a site plan indicating the proposed site / boundary as it relates to the parcel.

Mr. Regan said the building meets criteria A, B, C, D, and F. He noted the significance of Anna Clise, Seattle Children’s Hospital, concrete method of construction, architectural style, and architect.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Treffers supported designation and cited criteria C, and D; he noted criteria A and B tie into those are better addressed under C. He noted women’s rights and history, nurses’ homes were not thoroughly explored; he noted the rarity of resources. He said it is not the best Georgian Revival, but it is unique in how it is applied to the nurses’ home/residential facility and connection to hospital. He said the building has integrity.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation under criteria C and D. He noted the building is an accompaniment to Children’s Hospital. He said he would like more information about women’s issues and the nurses’ home concept. He noted the concrete gable roof was interesting and a different method. He said it is not outstanding example of Georgian Revival, but it is interesting.
Ms. Patterson agreed with Staff Recommendation, criteria C and D. She was curious about when the hospital moved to Laurelhurst and if there was a nurses’ home there. She said that not many landmarks specifically recognize women’s history. She noted the significance that only single women could be nurses and they were on call 24/7. She said you can’t tell 100% that it is a concrete building but knowing that it is, is interesting. She said a 2005 Historylink article noted the Children’s Hospital Board of Trustees was still run entirely by women up to 2005.

Mr. Freitas supported designation on criteria C and D. He noted the significance of women’s occupational history and that this is a representation of a charity hospital where health was subsidized for the poor.

Ms. Durham supported designation on criteria C and D and noted the significance of women’s history and their occupational history. She said her grandmother was a nurse and was required to leave nursing when she married. She said it would be lovely to share the history of the building with an interpretative plaque.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C and D. She didn’t support F and said the building is an invisible corner building.

Mr. Chalana supported Criterion C; he noted women’s history. He said it is a significant piece of history and there aren’t many sites like this. He said Anna Clise was remarkable; she raised money gathered women and made this happen. He noted her vision for caring for the less fortunate. He said he would like to know more about her. He didn’t support Criterion D and described the building style as “Brutalist Craftsman”.

Mr. Coney supported designation on criteria C and D. He noted the cultural impact of Children’s Hospital to Seattle. He said the method of construction is not apparent, but the building exhibits the character of its period. He said occupational housing for women is significant as well.

Ms. Johnson supported designation on criteria C and D. She said the building has integrity; she noted the history of working women and the method of construction as important. She said it is a different type of building – a nurses’ home.

Mr. Kiel noted the history of women in Seattle and Criterion B was appropriate to honor Anna Clise.

Ms. Johnson wondered about the concrete structure.

Mr. Chalana said in the 1920s it was early technology and it was designed to fit into a residential neighborhood. He said the entire building was concrete at a time when lumber was cheap.

Ms. Patterson said Criterion D should be included with respect to method of construction— if you are inside and look up, it is very clear. She started to make a motion.

Board members wanted to discuss possibility of recognizing Anna Clise in designation.

Mr. Chalana said that the building was not just built for women, it was created by women and women lived in the building three decades.
Ms. Johnson said that Criterion C is the strongest standard for that reason.

Mr. Freitas said history can be interpreted and Criterion C encapsulates that in a broader way.

Ms. Patterson said looking at nurses’ homes, Criterion C is the stronger one. She said Criterion B would be for one philanthropist rather than all women.

Mr. Treffers said she had a clear role in establishment of an institution or this building.

There was discussion about Anna Clise; she is significant, but her significance is wrapped up in Criterion C.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Francis Skinner Edris Nurses Home at 2120 1st Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C and D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building; and a portion of the site defined by the north, west, and east boundaries of Parcel A, and the south edge of the easement for Queen Anne Manor.


Anhalt Hall
711 NE 43rd Street

Nathan Rosenbaum, owner, said he purchased the building in 2016 and made improvements to it. He said tenants reside in it now. He said he is enjoying the landmarking process and just purchased another historic property in Tacoma. He said it is possible to gain a return on investment in historic properties.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, acknowledged Larry Kreisman, David Rash, and Michael Houser for their contributions to the report. She provided context of the site and neighborhood and said the house was moved in 1958 for the construction of I-5. She said the building has two stories and six apartments. She said it is brick which is characteristic of an Anhalt building. She said the non-original entry doesn’t detract. She said the construction of I-5 had a significant impact on the 1928 building and the neighborhood. On the original site two single family structures to the south were not part of this property; a couple owned the Pasadena building and the 6th Avenue structure had a high rate of turnover and was likely a rental.

She said the building has integrity and can convey its significance. She said the original windows are intact, the roofing and half timbers remain. She said the south side basement windows have been replaced but don’t detract from the building. She said the move is part of the history of the building and I-5. She said it may meet Criterion A for its association with construction of I-5 but noted thousands of buildings were relocated for that reason. She said it may meet Criterion B; Bjarne Moe, who worked for Anhalt, was a tenant in the building for a short period of time and his siblings lived there. He was a theater designer. She said that Anhalt’s in-laws lived there a while and a purple heart veteran lived there. She said it meets Criterion C for its association with the development
of the University District and its association with construction of I-5. She said it was located between the Latona and Brooklyn neighborhoods. She said it meets Criterion D for its Tudor Revival style and what many call the “Anhalt style”. She said it is a storybook style although on the Loveless Building it is more restrained. She noted the Tudor elements: half timbers, rustic bricks, steep pitched roof. She said it meets Criterion E for Anhalt. She said he put all these things into this small building; he was owner and contractor. There are five Anhalt market buildings, 18 apartment buildings. He noted apartment buildings had courtyards and separate entrances. She said he collaborated often with Whitely.

She said that Anhalt went bankrupt and the building was repossessed. He rebuilt his life. He collected scraps and materials and believed that salvaged timber and the clinker brick was stronger. He got quality into his buildings without spending a lot of money. She said he got into sale of garden compost. He purchased a tract of land and started Shurgard Nursery and eventually sold the property to the University of Washington. He received an honorary AIA membership. She said this building stands out for its small scale and use of materials. She said the neighborhood was rezoned and this is the only building from this period; it is unique and stands out.

Mr. Coney asked about the proposed up-zone.

Mr. Rosenbaum said it is 75’.

Mr. Hodgins wondered how many structures were moved for the construction of I-5.

Ms. Mirro said more study is needed and said it is challenging because King County destroyed their records of all the impacted properties. Responding to questions she said there was a basement in the original site, but a new basement was created when the building was moved.

Ms. Barker said that Anhalt was a butcher and had a non-traditional path toward architecture. She said that three of his buildings are landmarks already.

Ms. Mirro said he did a lot of things.

Ms. Johnson supported designation on Criterion D; she noted the Tudor Revival building is in good shape. She said the move is part of its story. She appreciated the owner’s interest in the building.

Mr. Coney supported designation on Criterion D and said that most Anhalt buildings could fit under that. He said the style is lasting and elegant. He said the move is anecdotal.

Ms. Johnson said that she drives by the building every day and it feels strange – it is a three-sided building that is not three-sided anymore.

Mr. Coney said it is a small-scale Anhalt. He said it is distressing when units are chopped up and he appreciated the original interior.
Mr. Chalana supported designation on Criterion D and said he wasn’t sure about A. He said the association with I-5 construction was disruptive and note a celebrated connection.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C, D, E, and F. She said it is an emblematic building and Anhalt did it all but on a very small building. She said the building age/type is a rarity in the area. She said that the freeway construction ripped the City apart.

Ms. Durham supported designation on criteria C, D, E, and F. She said that the association with I-5 is significant; a negative association doesn’t mean it is not significant and noted the path of destruction that came through the City. She said that Criterion C feels broadest in ability to capture economic and political impact on the City. She said that Anhalt had a big role in many things in the City, especially apartment buildings.

Mr. Freitas supported designation on criteria C and D. He said it is very hard for a moved property to be listed on the National Register.

Ms. Patterson supported designation on criteria A, D, and F. She said the Anhalt style is his style of Tudor Revival; each is recognizable as one of his. She said it would be great to do a multi-property nomination on this branded style. She said all elements respond to the site they were on. She said this building was moved; the original basement apartment responded to its site and here it is different – a full basement was constructed. She said it is connected to the history of I-5 which had a significant effect on the City. She said not every relocated building is still standing.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation and noted Criterion D; he noted it was an Anhalt lovefest and noted the evolution of his style. He said there are arguments for both criteria A or C. He supported Criterion F and called the building a rose in the middle of a desert – it is out of the ordinary. He said that even at its original location it would have been unique.

Ms. Patterson noted the contrast of siting of the three-sided building not meant for its current site.

Mr. Treffers supported designation and said Anhalt is important in the history of Seattle. He said the building embodies the Tudor style. He said it is unique for Anhalt; it is a smaller multi-family building. He said I-5 construction was a significant event, but thousands of buildings were moved and this one is no more significant than the others relocated. He said it is an interesting part of its story. He was hesitant to support Criterion F but said the ‘rose in the desert’ metaphor works; it contrasts in age in neighborhood.

Mr. Kiel said it is important to note that we don’t bestow history; it is there, and we determine which criteria is meets. He said that criteria D and E are interesting, and this is a nice example of Anhalt’s work. He didn’t support Criterion F.

Ms. Durham said it is an easily identifiable feature of the neighborhood.

Mr. Chalana did not support Criterion A and said that I-5 construction impacted everything in the City and Criterion C better captures that.
Ms. Barker supported designation and said that I-5 was the Denny Regrade of its time. She said this is one building where its move could be documented. She said thousands were moved; this one was documented. She said Criterion C best captures that.

Ms. Patterson thanked the owner for bring forth the nomination and investing in the building. She appreciated the pro-preservation stance.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of Anhalt Hall at 711 NE 43rd Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site and the exterior of the building.

Motion carried. Mr. Treffers opposed.
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Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator