



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 518/18

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday September 5, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Russell Coney
Kathleen Durham
Rich Freitas
Alan Guo
Garrett Hodgins
Jordan Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Steven Treffers

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Manish Chalana

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

090518.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 18, 2018

MM/SC/DB/GH

4:0:4 Minutes approved. Ms. Durham, Messrs. Treffers, Kiel and Guo abstained.

090518.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

090518.21 Harvard Exit/ Women’s Century Club
807 E Roy St

Ms. Nashem explained the Special Tax Incentive Program. She reported that the submitted rehabilitation costs were \$7,611,567; eligible costs were \$7,611,567. She said that work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board. Responding to clarifying questions she explained that interior and exterior improvements were included.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 807 E Roy St, the Harvard Exit/Women’s Century Club, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/ST/GH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Coney arrived at 3:40 pm.

090518.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

090518.31 NSDAR Rainier Chapter House
800 East Roy St
Proposed tree removal and replacement

Postponed.

090518.32 Eitel Building
1501 Second Avenue
Proposed mural on west elevation

Patrick Foley, Lake Union Partners, reported that renovation of the building is underway. He proposed adding a mural by Shepard Fairey to a new portion of the building.

Mr. Kiel said ARC reviewed the application and noted that the mural is proposed for a non-historic wall, away from historic material. He said it is nice public art and there is no impact to the landmark.

Mr. Freitas asked for clarification on where the mural will be.

Mr. Foley said it will be painted on a new framed wall with stucco and windows.

Ms. Sodt said that at Controls discussion the board contemplated that the lightwell would need to be utilized because of the small floor plate. The Controls document says the board anticipates the lightwell will be infilled.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations, at the Eitel Building, 1501 Second Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Ordinance No. 123534 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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/ST 9:0:0 Motion carried.

090518.33

Satterlee House

4866 Beach Drive SW

Proposed perimeter fencing and landscape lighting

Ms. Doherty presented on behalf of the applicant and explained the proposed perimeter fencing, lights in plantings along the driveway and along street. She said they will take away the non-approved fencing and will just have all picket fence. She said that Historic Seattle has an easement on the property – the house and use of property – and is OK with new fencing proposal, noting it fits the character of the house. She said the 3'6" fence will have natural clear coat stain.

Mr. Freitas said it sounds like a big change covering a large area.

Ms. Doherty said the house sits back on the property and the front yard is quite large. Proposed low fence is for west and south edges of lawn, along with plantings and low landscape lighting.

Ms. Barker said it is a light touch.

Mr. Coney said the house will still be visible.

Public Comment:

Mark Hannum said he was on the board when a proposed project for new residences was denied and subsequently went to Hearing Examiner and Supreme Court. The applicant lost the appeal and the Board's decision was upheld. He said the board thought the development was out of scale and suggested more subservient cottages. He said the owner pleaded economic hardship. He said that people think of it as a park and wonder onto the property, that may be why they want a fence.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site alterations along driveway and street and will replace non-approved fence at the Satterlee House, 4866 Beach Drive 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 Ordinance No. 111022 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/DB/CH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

090518.34 Pacific Science Center
200 2nd Avenue North
Proposed telecommunications equipment

Joel Aro, Lynx Consulting, proposed modification of existing cell site within existing stealth shroud. He noted concern about one antenna that appears to be outside of the shroud and said it is a mistake and should be inside. He proposed one for one replacement of antenna behind shroud.

Ms. Barker asked if a photo simulation was provided.

Mr. Aro said the shrouds aren't visible from anywhere except a few residential units up high. He said the shroud looks like an elevator shaft.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed rooftop equipment at the Pacific Science Center, 200 2nd Avenue North, 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. 124932 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/DB/KJ 9:0:0 Motion carried.

Order of agenda changed; waiting for University of Washington representative.

090518.5 NOMINATION

090518.51 Mount Baker Community Club Clubhouse
2811 Mount Rainier Drive South

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

Mr. Howard provided context of the neighborhood and site. The Craftsman style building was constructed in two sections; the east facing has a gambrel roof and the west has a gable roof. He said the building has original shingles, clapboard siding, shed roof dormers. He said the sloped site accommodates 1 ½ stories above grade with 2 ½ stories above grade on the Mt. Baker side. He noted the classrooms, storage and said the space accessed from the west is used as a pre-school. He said the mid-level ball room is the main function space with service and storage room, kitchen, restrooms. The mezzanine level overlooks the ballroom and has access from the east. He said the original wood floors, casework and trim are extant. He said the ceiling was rebuilt in 1992 after an arson event; rebuilding was based on historic photos.

Ms. Pratt explained Mt. Baker plat addition and the promotion of development with deed restrictions, setbacks, and a minimum investment. The clubhouse was advertised as an amenity for the neighborhood; it was not constructed until 1914. She said the Mt. Baker Park addition advertised winding boulevards, street car line service to neighborhood, and an exclusive community life.

The Mt. Baker Improvement Club was established in 1908 and promoted the development of Mt. Baker Park properties. All property owners had a share in the club. There were many committees including fire, sewer, paving, police, among others. She said restrictions included only single-family homes, no non-whites or minorities, no other clubs, schools, churches; it was discriminatory early in its development history. In the 1960's that changed to multi-racial residents and homeowners, and the adoption of new bylaws eliminating discrimination. The club was open to all residents and not just property owners.

Ms. Pratt reported that Charles Haines was the developer and Charles Dose was the builder. Dose was on the executive committee for the club and developed the Dose Addition where he built several houses. He and his wife Phoebe were involved in the development of the club. Dose had no formal training but identified himself as an architect. The hybrid of Craftsman and Colonial styles provided an eclectic appearance which was typical of the era and of the neighborhood.

She said the clubhouse was the heart of the neighborhood and was the place to bring the neighborhood together. She said the building has a high level of integrity and retains the character of the era.

Mr. Hodgins asked if there are before and after photos of the fire damage.

Mr. Howard said there aren't.

Mark Hannum, Mt. Baker Community Club, said the repair was done as quickly as possible.

Mr. Coney asked if there was any dimensional change to the second-floor storage area trusses.

Mr. Hannum said the shape is exactly the same.

Ms. Johnson asked about the windows.

Mr. Hannum said that half were damaged and replaced with true divided lights, but the upper windows are all original.

Ms. Barker asked if the garage was removed.

Mr. Hannum said it was a building that predates the brick structure to the north; it was built in the 1930's.

Ms. Barker asked if it was connected.

Mr. Hannum said no, it was a separate building.

Ms. Barker asked why the two roof types.

Mr. Howard said he was unable to find anything explaining that. The clubhouse is reminiscent of the other building's architecture, but he does not know why.

Mr. Treffers asked about the shift in discriminatory practices and if they were behind the times, or ahead. He asked if they were pushing civil rights as well.

Mr. Hannum said there was a lot of redlining. He said there was a stigma and home tours began to counter redlining.

Mr. Howard said the club was responsive to a broader trend and he hesitated to call them 'leading'. The 1968 school sit-ins at Franklin High School were more on the leading edge. He said the responsiveness of the committee was to a change in demographics in the neighborhood; they were not a leading force in driving change.

Mr. Hannum said there was a move to put in an expressway that would have mowed down much of the area; there was big community activism to stop that project.

Mr. Durham asked how many community clubs there were in the 1960s and if this one was a leader or influential in any way.

Ms. Pratt said they can research that.

Mr. Freitas asked about circulation and how the space is used.

Mr. Hannum said the entrance to the daylight basement is on the west side. He said that a ramp was added for ADA, and a play area was added for the daycare. He didn't know if the vegetation is original.

Ms. Doherty said the street was raised on the east side, so things were reconfigured.

Mr. Hodgins asked about the proposed gym and bowling alley.

Mr. Hannum said they never happened.

Ms. Johnson asked about public versus private, community clubs versus City community centers.

Ms. Pratt wasn't sure when that happened.

Ms. Barker noted a recent PBS program, "Ten Parks That Changed America", and said they talked about community centers.

Ms. Johnson noted Olmsted Parks as community centers.

Mr. Hodgins said the club was built in the early 1900s. He asked how many other examples are extant and how many neighborhoods had covenants with restrictions.

Ms. Pratt said University of Washington has research materials which illustrate pockets in the City where covenants with restrictions existed. She said she will provide a link to the civil rights project to landmarks staff so that it can be shared with the board members.

Mr. Coney asked if other clubs were organized like this one where each owner gets one share. He asked how this building compares to others by Dose.

Mr. Hannum explained the plans to cut a sluice channel over to Lake Washington; this area would have been a port and dock land. It didn't happen, so they ended up with a whole tract and were able to build this community.

Ms. Pratt said a National Register historic district designation is pending.

Public Comment:

Bill Davis, Mt. Baker Community Club board member, said there are no dues now and everyone in the neighborhood is a member. He said they have 501C3 status.

Mr. Hannum said that the Bylaws now say membership is for anyone who lives, works, or plays in the neighborhood.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Treffers supported nomination of site, exterior, interior, ballroom and public space. He said it is a remarkable property and is significant in the community. He said the architecture is unique and it has integrity. He

requested additional information on how this building compares to the architect's other work, if there is any more information on the bylaws and covenants.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and inclusion of interior ballroom and entry components. She asked for more information on the 'dueling roof types'. She requested information on Dose's self-proclaimed architect title and how he was seen by other architects who had education. She wanted information on clubhouse issues, what was fought for or against to get a picture of the occupants over time.

Ms. Doherty said it was common for non-architects to design/develop buildings at that time and noted Anhalt as another example.

Ms. Durham supported nomination and said the 'community club' is interesting and that it was common to have these clubs in the 1910-20s. She said there is a dissertation about this at UW. She requested more information on how much they operated as a political organization and fit in with Civil Rights movement.

Mr. Hodgins supported nomination and wanted more information about development of the neighborhood and the later integration context.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and wanted more information about community clubs.

Mr. Coney supported nomination and inclusion of interior. He said they seemed to be reacting to sign of times and not leading the charge. He said the lawsuits were interesting.

Mr. Freitas supported nomination as an institution reflecting social history in the context of civil rights in Seattle. He said he is interested in knowing more about the relationship of the building to its site in this designed neighborhood.

Mr. Guo supported nomination and wanted more about how the demographics changed over time. He wanted to know if the president, and members of color mentioned were exceptions or representative of the community overall.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination and wanted more information about community clubs and their roles, the link about redlining, Dose, interior information and demographics.

Mr. Hodgins recommended nomination of entire interior and exterior. A tour could help refine areas of interior.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Mount Baker Community Club Clubhouse at 2811-2815 Mount Rainier Drive South 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 interior and exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for October 17, 2018; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/KD/GH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

090518.4 DESIGNATION

090518.41 University of Washington Parrington Hall
4105 Memorial Drive Northeast

Mr. Kiel disclosed he has been working with Julie Blakeslee on Bothell Campus project. Neither Ms. Blakeslee (University of Washington) nor the board members had issue with his participation.

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

Mr. Howard went over context and said the staff recommended 30' offset from the base of the building includes the front steps. Parrington Hall is a 3.5-story, load-bearing brick masonry academic building with a T-shaped plan. The building stands at the southeast end of Parrington Lawn, fronting George Washington Lane Northeast. The building consists of a central block with semi-circular side wings and a rear wing. A narrow hyphen connects the rear wing to the central block. A front gable on hip roof shelters the central block, with conical roofs and skylights over the side wings and a hip roof at the north wing with a side gable sheltering the hyphen. All roofs feature projecting eaves with enclosed soffits with decorative sheet metal detailing. Low brick parapets extend out at the east and west wings. Gable roof dormers project from the north and south slopes and shed roof dormers on the east and west slopes of the main hip roof. Building walls feature a red brick veneer with decorative corbeling at story transitions, openings, and outer corners. Stone serves as a functional and decorative element at sills and belt courses. Wood sash windows provide daylighting. He noted unique pressed tile at the foundation base. He said the front entrance faces south and is serviced by a flight of concrete stairs and a concrete landing. A recessed wood frame entrance consists of a pair of doors with sidelights and leaded glass fan light transom.

Mr. Howard reported 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. Egress stairs in the north and south ends of the building provide emergency egress capacity but are generally not part of occupant circulation within the building. He said interior finishes have all be updated; the volume is there but components have been rebuilt. He said faux transom is a later alteration.

Ms. Pratt reported that the University of Washington began as the Washington Territorial University in 1861 when the Washington Territorial Legislature incorporated the school. The university, the first university in the territory, opened its doors to 30 students on November 4, 1861. The original campus was located on a ten-acre parcel in present-day downtown Seattle, then the outskirts of Seattle. That property was donated by Arthur and Mary Denny, Charles and Mary Terry, and Edward Lander. The university hired architect William E. Boone in 1891 to create a comprehensive plan for the new campus, but the Boone Plan, as it was called, was deemed too extravagant and not implemented.

Engineer professor A.H. Fuller developed a plan for the campus, called the Oval Plan, in 1898 (see Figure 8). 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, Observatory, a men's dormitory, and a women's dormitory. Fuller's Oval Plan made sense of the four buildings' locations and recommended future buildings be grouped in an oval around an open space. Parrington Hall, originally called Science Hall was the first building constructed in accordance with this plan, followed by a power house. It was located south and west of the Administration Building. Fuller's plan also established the basic circulation relationship between the street grid west of 15th Avenue NE and the campus.

Following the implementation of the Oval Plan, a series of campus plans were created and implemented to manage development on the university campus. Local architect and founder of the university's newly formed architecture department, Carl F. Gould designed the Regents Plan of 1915. This plan became the guiding document for the university for the next two decades. Collegiate Gothic was established as the predominant architectural style for new construction, which persisted into the 1950s. The 1962 General Development Plan and 1965 General Planning and Development Plan, designed by Paul Thiry (1962) and Walker & McGough (1965), recommended the introduction of larger developments on the campus including the plaza garage, Red Square and surrounding buildings, additions to Suzzallo Library, and a range of new buildings (science, medical, professional, recreation, and residential). These plans also substantially reconfigured the northwest portion of the campus, including the proposed removal of Parrington Hall to build out a series of buildings in this area.

Ms. Pratt reported that Richardsonian Romanesque in style, the building continues basic stylistic elements of Lewis Hall (1896) and Clark Hall (1896).

Stylistically, Parrington Hall (1902) differs from the French Renaissance Revival style Denny Hall (1894), but shares some form elements, including the T-shaped plan, gable roof dormers, and wing towers. Relative to the men's and women's dormitories, Parrington Hall shares the same T-shaped footprint; use of rough-faced stone to accent lintels, gable end details, and the water table through contrasting texture and color relative to the brick facade; hipped roof with cross gable; and formerly, a front entrance portico.

She said a museum now occupies the north wing. The building has been used for science and engineering departments for thirty years. He said a facelift done in 1908 as part of the Alaskan Yukon Exposition painted the brick white to complement other white buildings constructed for the exposition. In 1931 the building was remodeled to house the engineering department and was renamed for Vernon Louis Parrington. In 1987 the building was remodeled and now houses the Evans School.

Ms. Pratt explained that Josenhans and Allen Architects, founded by Timotheus Anton Christof Josenhans and Norris Best Allan, practiced in Seattle between 1897 and 1912. Numerous Seattle buildings are attributed to this architectural partnership, including three on the University of Washington campus: Women's Dormitory/Pierrepont Hall (William Clark Hall), Men's Dormitory (Meriwether Lewis Hall), and Parrington Hall (Science Hall).

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Hodgins supported designation for Criterion D and questioned inclusion of Criterion C – where do we draw the line.

Ms. Barker supported designation. Regarding Criterion C she said the building made it through the AYP and survives today. It was part of the Oval Plan. She said it meets Criterion D for its Richardsonian Romanesque style. She said it meets Criterion E and said there are examples of other educational buildings, this one is more rigorous. She said it meets Criterion F; the original color is now back. The building feels more of a destination. It was built to learn in and has authority.

Mr. Freitas supported designation on criteria D, E and F. He didn't support inclusion of Criterion C. He said the building is important to the early development of the campus and as part of the Oval Plan. He noted the building's relationship to the original four buildings.

Ms. Durham supported designation and said she agreed with Ms. Barker's comments. She noted the AYP's impact on the city and the role of World's Fairs in cities and the legacies they have created. She noted the link and how

cities developed around those celebrations. She said the building is intact, prominent and is an important relic. She said the building is significant architecturally, historically, and for its architects.

Mr. Hodgins said it was built as a UW building and just participated in the AYP.

Ms. Barker said it was built as the science building and was whitewashed to participate in the AYP. It was returned to its use for education.

Mr. Treffers said it was consciously incorporated into the design of the AYP and was painted to bring it in.

Mr. Freitas said it was a witness to AYP, but not a part of it.

Ms. Johnson said the architecture is great; the campus plans adjusted themselves to incorporate, or not, the building. She said the siting is interesting. She said the UW culture is important and not every building is significant.

Mr. Coney supported designation and said it meets Criterion C because it is one of the original parts of the Oval Plan. He said it was the first academic building. He agreed with the Staff Report.

Mr. Guo supported designation and noted the cultural impact as a destination where people go to take pictures of cherry blossoms. He said it is a destination on campus.

Mr. Kiel agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation.

Mr. Treffers supported designation but said he wasn't strong on Criterion C. He said the building is remarkable. He appreciated inclusion of interior volume rather than specific features.

Ms. Barker said the building meets Criterion C; there aren't any other AYP buildings there.

Ms. Doherty said that there are some left.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the University of Washington Parrington Hall at 4105 Memorial Drive NE as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified 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.

MM/SC/GH/RC 9:0:0 Motion carried.

090518.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator