



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 390/18

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday July 18, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Russell Coney
Rich Freitas
Garrett Hodgins
Kristen Johnson
Nicole McKernan
Julianne Patterson

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Manish Chalana
Kathleen Durham
Jordon Kiel
Steven Treffers

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

071818.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 16, 2018

MM/SC/KJ/GH 6:0:0 Minutes approved.

June 6, 2018

MM/SC/GH/KJ 5:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Barker abstained.

Items reviewed out of agenda order.

071818.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

071818.21 Bon Marche/Macy’s Building
300 Pine Street
Proposed signage

Dwayne Gowers and Jack McCullough presented. Mr. Gowers provided before and after photos and said they will use the existing housing and replace the graphic with “Victrola Coffee”.

Ms. Barker asked if the step had been corrected.

Mr. Gowers said it had.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Barker said ARC reviewed the application; she supported the change.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage at the Bon Marche/Macy’s Building, 300 Pine Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 114772, 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.

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

071818.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

071818.41 Seattle Japanese Language School
1414 South Weller Street

Ms. Doherty explained the signed agreement.

Mr. Freitas said that tree age should be specified as well as its size.

Ms. Doherty said she would craft language for future agreements.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Japanese Language School, 1414 South Weller Street.

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

071818.44 American Meter & Appliance Building / Frederick Boyd & Co.
1001-1005 Westlake Avenue North
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for extension to December 19, 2018 and said she was supportive.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the American Meter & Appliance Building, 1001-1005 Westlake Avenue North, to December 19, 2018.

MM/SC/JP/RF 6:0:0 Motion carried.

071818.45 Bleitz Funeral Home
316 Florentia Street
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for extension to November 7, 2018 and said she was supportive. She said the construction and site improvement project is evolving and they will likely be briefing at least once more before submitting for final approval.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Bleitz Funeral Home, 316 Florentia Street, until November 7, 2018.

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

071818.46 Seven Gables Theater
911 NE 50th Street
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for extension to November 7, 2018. She said they are still reviewing options for the property and need more time.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Seven Gables Theater, 911 NE 50th Street, until November 7, 2018.

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

071818.47 Sullivan House
1632 15th Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained that the owner's representative asked for an extension but did not specify the date or time, nor did they say they would be coming to today's meeting. She suggested a three-month extension. She said they are considering the financial aspects to impose no controls. She said she shared public comment with them.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Sullivan House, 1632 15th Avenue, for three months.

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

071818.48 East Pine Substation
1501 23rd Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a six-month extension due to staff changes. She said the language is similar to that of Broad Street Substation. She said they are coming to ARC to show proposed project to expand the switchyard.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the East Pine Substation, 1501 23rd Avenue, for six months.

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

071818.23 Franklin High School
3013 South Mount Baker Boulevard
Proposed replacement of windows and doors

Lorne McConachie, Bassetti Architects, provided a window and door assessment and methodology. He showed iterations of the school, the original buildings and additions. He went over window assessment noting age and condition; he said ¾ are in poor condition. He proposed to replace the windows with aluminum clad wood windows. He said the school budgeting doesn't have money for big maintenance project. He said there is water intrusion into the walls. He said the school was designated under criteria C, D, and F. He said the window surrounds are terracotta, brick, arches, and set off fenestration; all are being repaired.

Mr. Coney arrived at 4:02 pm.

Mr. McConachie said they will replace the medallions and will match the exact size and profile. A dimensional comparison window was reviewed, and he said it is similar and within ¼” – ½” of historic window profiles. He said the lintels remain but three will be replaced. He said the proposed cream color window frames and sashes will match the terracotta on the building and was the original window paint color used. He said they propose to replicate the original doors which were in dark color without muntins and will restore the wood transom windows above the doors.

Ms. Barker said ARC reviewed the application several times.

Ms. Patterson asked why the medallion would be replaced with fiberglass rather than wood.

Mr. McConachie said putting wood on the aluminum clad window system would be a compatibility issue. He said the medallion will match exactly except the material type.

Ms. Patterson noted a 2” variation with some window profiles.

Mr. McConachie said the worst is the sill, lower sash; he will see if they can get a custom extrusion.

Ms. Patterson asked about the expected life space of a window without maintenance.

Mr. McConachie said 30 years minimum. He said these should have been replaced ten years ago. The new windows will look better and the building will hold its own better.

Ms. Patterson asked about performing maintenance on aluminum window.

Mr. McConachie said that hardware is missing, and the windows have experienced hard use.

Mark Sneddon, Seattle Public Schools (SPS), said the double hung windows have a pivot feature. He said the windows are faux divided lights with snap-in mullion. He said it is a good angle from a maintenance aspect.

Ms. McKernan asked about the glass color in the doors.

Mr. McConachie said it will be clear with Low E coating and laminated for safety; it will look same as windows. Responding to questions he said he didn’t know where the doors are from and that they were there in 1988. He noted the 1911 doors on drawings and photos.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Johnson said ARC reviewed and noted many schools have approved aluminum clad wood windows although they preferred the wood be retained. She said she was comfortable approving the application.

Mr. Coney said he was opposed to wholesale replacement and cited Secretary of Interiors Standard #6. He said there was a complete restoration in 1988 and if the windows had been maintained they might have lasted longer. He said SPS should embrace the historic status of the buildings.

Ms. Doherty said a window fell out; so, the School District initiated a window survey to assess condition issues.

Mr. Freitas said the board is being asked to compromise based on deferred maintenance priorities of SPS. He appreciated the applicant representative referencing the designation criteria and why the building is a landmark, but the building needs to be preserved as a landmark.

Mr. Hodgins said there are not consistent groups of windows that could be repaired. He echoed Mr. Coney's comments but said a nice replacement option is proposed and he leaned toward supporting the application. He noted the bigger picture but said it was a tough decision.

Ms. Patterson was reluctant to approve wholesale replacement of windows. She said it is important to maintain consistency. She appreciated the designation criteria presented. She encouraged modifications to stay closer to original dimensions.

Ms. McKernan agreed with Mr. Coney's comments. She said that almost every grouping has one compromised, mostly on south and east sides and the north and west sides are piecemeal. She said the visual appearance of different windows would detract from the Landmark.

Mr. Coney said to make sure the new windows are an exact replica of what is there.

Ms. McKernan said that if the proposed work will help Franklin stand longer then she would support it.

Ms. Johnson echoed her colleagues but said she would support it as well.

Ms. Barker concurred and said she was initially opposed; she commented that there is no ongoing School District maintenance plan for their historic buildings.

Mr. Freitas said his support was conditional, that the existing historic fabric could become physically compromised without the window replacement.

Mr. McConachie said they need to protect the building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at Franklin High School, 3013 South Mount Baker Boulevard, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. Proposed window and door replacement affects the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation LPB 337/86, as the proposed work removes historic materials that characterize the property. However, the applicant has

demonstrated the need to make these alterations based on condition and is proposing to replace the windows and doors in a manner that is consistent with the size, scale, and proportion of the historic features, 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/KJ/GH 5:2:0 Motion carried. Messrs. Coney and Freitas opposed.

071818.22

Troy Laundry Building
311-329 Fairview Avenue North
Proposed signage

Martha Davis, City Lights Signs, explained the banner type sign will be constructed of 3/4" square tubing to create the frame, with Dibond material for sign. She said lights at the bottom will be powered via conduit and junction box; power will run through frame to top, across the brick and then through the window. She said that straps holding conduit will be fastened in grout, not brick. Conduit will be visible outside and will run across a brick column, but it was the shortest distance they could do.

Ms. McKernan asked if sign will be easily removable if tenant changes.

Ms. Davis said it is made as one piece.

Ms. McKernan suggested making the inside portion removable. She asked if conduit crosses over inset.

Ms. Davis said it won't cross the inset.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Coney suggest the sign be in a bracket with the sign face removable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage at the Troy Laundry Building, 311-329 Fairview Avenue N., as per the attached submittal, amended that sign panel and frame can be removed from bracket.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 118047, 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.

MM/SC/NM/JP 7:0:0 Motion carried.

071818.3 BRIEFING

071818.31 Daniel Webster Elementary School
3014 NW 67th Street
Proposed replacement of windows

Ms. Doherty explained the window replacement is part of a larger project that has been reviewed by ARC.

Brian Ho, TCF Architecture, provided context of the building on the site and scope of work. He said they plan to build a gym addition, but the focus of the briefing would be the windows in the Naramore Addition. He went over designated features – site, exteriors, some interior space, and the north stairs. He provided photo comparisons of different eras of the windows and present-day conditions. He went over window assessment of original 1908 building and 1933 addition (in DON file) and said the overall proposal is to match the window configuration original to each phase of construction.

Ms. Patterson asked why they chose the styles they did.

Mr. Ho said the south façade windows on the 1908 building were nearly all replaced in the 1930s to look like those in 1933 building. He said the north side windows have not been replaced and are still in their original configuration with modified transoms and some sashes missing; they have been boarded up. He said they felt that keeping original configuration is truer to original building and how it was designed. He said it is more appropriate in proportioning and there is clear differentiation between the two eras.

Ms. Barker asked about difference between ‘deterioration’ and ‘structural failure’ as noted on page 10 of their report.

Mr. Ho said there is some rot, peeling paint, and some deterioration to mullions etc. He said there are two primary doors – main entry on the south in the 1908 building and door is from the 1980s, and on the east side in the 1933 building and door there is original. He said they will refinish what is there. He said they are looking at occupant comfort and long-term maintainability with what is proposed.

Ms. Patterson asked ARC opinion on replacement of 1908 windows with 1/1 sashes.

Ms. Doherty said ARC recommended approval. She noted that the current windows are from 1930s alterations and while they could have achieved their own significance, the ARC noted it was better to go back to the original appearance so that the eras of building are clear. She said there are only some incomplete pieces of original windows on the north facade.

Ms. Johnson said that not all original windows were replaced, and it is odd that some original remain in part.

Mr. Coney said the group of windows on the 1933 addition makes a cohesive whole. The Standards for Rehabilitation say to repair before replace. He said he understands the reality of not having a budget for maintenance. He said any window can be replicated in-

kind and noted it was done at the Kelly-Springfield building in Capitol Hill. He said these 1933 windows have lasted with no maintenance but would have lasted longer if given treatment. He noted SPS comments that windows are being replaced for occupant comfort and said he was a student in Seattle Public Schools and was not impacted by having old windows. He said the insulated glass assemblies are not as efficient as they make it sound.

Ms. Doherty said the applicants believe the windows cannot be repaired.

Ms. Johnson said that select windows at Magnolia were restored. She said why keep only five windows when they are replacing the rest.

Ms. Patterson said they could keep all on the 1930 addition. She said wholesale replacement on the 1933 building is not justified.

Ms. McKernan noted that the majority of windows are listed as restorable in SPS's report.

Mr. Freitas said repair is preferred to replacement; and then in-kind replacement is preferred to other options.

Ms. Barker said there are surface defects and the 1933 addition's windows are far from needing replacement.

Eric Becker, SPS, said there is structural failure on the south façade and they will have to do masonry restoration; he said they expect to find defects. He said they are concerned about the costs. He said restorable condition is a starting point but the cost could be higher. He said comfort does impact their educational mission and the cost of energy bills impact their ability to pay for education.

Ms. Barker said more information is needed on the south side failure of the 1933 addition.

To clarify, Ms. Doherty said that if the south windows on the addition cannot be repaired, in-kind replacement to match the other wood windows is the Board's preference.

Ms. Patterson said there are plenty of ways to make historic windows perform energy-wise.

071818.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES *continued*

071818.42 Anhalt Hall
711 Northeast 43rd Street

Ms. Doherty went through the agreement.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for Anhalt Hall, 711 Northeast 43rd Street.

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

071818.43 University of Washington Canoe House / ASUW Shell House
3655 Walla Walla Road Northeast

Ms. Doherty read through the agreement.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the University of Washington Canoe House / ASUW Shell House, 3655 Walla Walla Road Northeast.

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

071818.5 NOMINATION

Ms. Barker left at 5:35 pm.

071818.51 University of Washington Parrington Hall
4105 Memorial Drive Northeast

Julie Blakeslee, University of Washington, said the building is one of the oldest on campus.

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

Mr. Howard provided context of the site. He said the building is 3 ½ stories with a partial basement. The building consists of a central block with semi-circular side wings and a rear wing. He said the central block has a hipped roof, two side wings have conical roofs, and two rear sections have hipped roof and gabled roof. He said the masonry building is clad with red brick veneer with red mortar, decorative brick corbelling at transitions between floors, and at outer corners. He noted sandstone wraps along base of first story. A recessed wood frame entrance consists of a pair of doors with sidelights and leaded glass fan light transom. The interior layout generally consists of a central double-loaded corridor running east—west and north—south within the building.

The building features a concrete below grade foundation with large, round aggregate. Tile courses alternate with projecting red brick stretcher courses.

Alterations:

- Circa 1908: Painting of the exterior for the 1909 Alaska Yukon Pacific Exposition.
- 1931: Remodel to provide modern facilities for the new tenant, the English Department, which involved substantial interior and exterior changes.
- 1962: Remodel enclosing the central stairway to provide fire enclosures at each floor.
- 1987: Remodel to provide modern facilities for the new tenant, the Graduate School of Public Affairs, which involved restoring the skylights, substantial interior changes, and most current materials, finishes, and spaces. Current interior doors, corridor finishes, interior trim, lighting, and stairway railings and tread all stem from this remodel.

- 1995: Remodel which involved substantial exterior changes, including a full seismic upgrade for the building and removing the ca. 1908 exterior paint and 1931 exterior additions, as well as substantial in-kind window replacements and repairs.

The interior layout generally consists of a central, T-shaped, double-loaded corridor on each floor. A central stairwell with stairways on either side and an elevator provide vertical circulation. He said the 1931 and 1987 remodels altered interior finishes substantially; walls were skim coated and exposed raceway cornices were built to hide services. He said at the north end stairs, fire doors were added, and the stairs were enclosed with partitions. He said the basement was converted from mechanical and storage to classrooms. He said the north wing used to be a museum and was converted to classrooms and offices in 1930.

Ms. Pratt reported on the early development of the University of Washington campus. She said in 1861, it was the Washington Territorial University and was in downtown Seattle. She said it was slow to grow but by the 1880's it started to flourish, and more space was needed to accommodate growth. Land was purchased, and Denny Hall, designed by Charles Saunders, was built in 1895. The university hired architect William E. Boone to create a plan for the new campus, but it was not adopted. Engineering professor A.H. Fuller developed a plan for the campus, called the Oval Plan, in 1898. The Oval Plan only included the northern portion of the campus. At the time the Oval Plan was developed, four buildings were present on campus: the Administration Building (Denny), the Observatory, men's dormitory, and women's dormitory (Lewis and Clark Halls). Fuller's Oval Plan made sense of the four buildings' locations and recommended future buildings be grouped in an oval around an open space. Science Hall, known today as Parrington Hall, was the first building constructed in accordance with this plan.

Following the implementation of the Oval Plan, a series of campus plans were created and implemented to manage development on the university campus: 1904 Olmsted, 1909 Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, 1915 Regents Plan, 1920 Revised Campus Plan, 1934 Regents Plan, 1948-49 Bindon & Jones, and the 1962 Development and 1965 General Planning and Development plans.

Ms. Pratt said the building was designed by Timotheus Anton Christof Josenhans and Norris Best Allan, who practiced in Seattle between 1897 and 1912. Numerous Seattle buildings are attributed to them, including three on the University of Washington campus: Women's Dormitory, Men's Dormitory, and Parrington Hall. During their partnership Josenhans and Allen designed nearly 100 buildings including Hambach Buildings 1 and 2, Marion Building, among others. Parrington Hall is one of 10 educational projects on which they worked.

Ms. Patterson asked why the portico was removed.

Mr. Howard said there is no record of why and no indication of its condition.

Ms. Pratt said now the giant lanterns became more visible.

Mr. Coney asked about seismic upgrade.

Mr. Howard said the building was seismically upgraded to 1995 standards; he said seismic ties at exterior are through mortar joints.

Public Comment:

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, thanked the University for stewardship of the building and for the nomination. He supported nomination and noted significance of Josenhans and Allen; he said it is one of the earliest buildings on the campus. He commented on the history of campus planning noted the Oval Plan.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Coney said he echoed Mr. Murdock's comments. He appreciated the University bringing the nomination forward and for the stewardship of the building. He said the 1988 work was sensitive and done to SOI Standards. He supported nomination based on the Staff Report.

Responding to question about including a portion of the site measured 30' out from the base of the building, Ms. Doherty said it will capture the main entry stair. She said Controls and Incentives could exclude footpaths.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination based on Staff Report. She thanked the University for stewardship and for bringing forth the nomination. She appreciated the report and presentation and said it was nice to see different plans for the campus. She said the building is uniquely tied to the early Oval Plan. She said it is easy to acquaint this building with its style.

Mr. Hodgins supported nomination and said it is a unique, historic, standout building; on the of the Oval Plan. He asked why the university moved away from downtown.

Ms. Pratt said it was a desire to be away from the City and for protection of students.

Mr. Freitas supported nomination, noted the architects, designers. He said it is a marker of the Oval Plan and the evolution of campus planning. He noted the importance of Parrington Lawn. He said the building is about its context; it responds to views and wondered if the boundary should be different. Otherwise he agreed with the Staff Report. He said is was important to planning and a nod to early time of the campus.

Ms. McKernan supported nomination and said to look at possible boundaries to capture the open space and landscape around the building. She said it is nice to maintain a healthy buffer, more than 30'. She said the spatial location is interesting and the campus plans were designed around this building; it is a constant that remained. She said the brick detailing is distinct.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination. She appreciated the condition and care given to the building. She appreciated seeing how the building relates to early plans.

Mr. Coney commented on the boundaries set for nomination.

Ms. Doherty noted other landmarks – SPU’s Alexander Hall, UW Canoe House, were measured in a similar fashion.

Ms. Johnson asked if the lawn is characteristic to the building.

Mr. Coney said the master plan has it as open space now.

Ms. Blakeslee said there are no proposed development sites adjacent to the subject building in their master plan.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of University of Washington Parrington Hall at 4105 Memorial Drive 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 exterior of the building; the interior room volumes and skylights of the 3rd floor east and west lecture spaces; and a portion of the site around the building perimeter measured thirty feet out from base of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for September 5, 2018; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

071818.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator