



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB182/20

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday March 4, 2020 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes
Manish Chalana
Russell Coney
Matt Inpanbutr
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Ian Macleod
Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Roi Chang
Lance Neely

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:38 p.m.

030420.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 4, 2019

MM/SC/KJ/IM

3:0:4 Minutes approved. Messrs. Inpanbutr, Kiel and Barnes, and Mmes. Wasserman abstained

030420.2 CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

030420.21 Columbia City Landmark District
4915 Rainier Ave. S.
Proposed signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of signs, consisting of:

One (1) horizontally oriented 2-sided blade sign. Dimensions: 20”h x 48”w. The sign will be illuminated by small directional lights, mounted to the sign frame. Revision to the logo of a previously approved wall sign. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. This 2-story commercial building was constructed in 2014. It is a non-contributing building within the Columbia City National Register District. The Landmarks Preservation Board approved signage for the business in 2018. This is a revision to the previously approved plans. On March 3, 2020 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee recommended approval for the signs, as proposed.

Martha Davis showed original blade sign drawings and said they changed the letter style to a horizontal formation. The letter style has a 3/8” depth and will be painted. She proposed adding linear lights on the side.

Mr. Coney asked if there was a light before.

Ms. Davis said no.

Ms. Frestedt said the committee had no issue with the proposal. She said the LED strip under the canopy was previously approved.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Coney was supportive.

Ms. Johnson said it was reasonable.

Mr. Kiel said it was OK.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs at 4915 Rainier Ave S., as proposed.

This action is based on the following:

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

Guidelines/Specific

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

The regulations in Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 23.55 (Signs) and the following guidelines shall apply to signs in the District. The provisions of these guidelines apply to at least the following: (1) any sign located out-of-doors; (2) indoor signs located within three feet of a window and visible from the street, sidewalk or other public place; and (3) "place of business" identification signs.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

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

Secretary of the Interior Standards

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 shall 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.

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

030420.22

Volunteer Park

1400 East Prospect Street

Proposed removal and replacement of bandshell

Owen Richards, ORA proposed replacing the existing outdoor stage and provide site enhancements and ADA access from road to amphitheater. He said the size will remain the same and the new structure will have a roof. He provided an overview of the site history and overall character and style of the landscape. He said that in the statement of significance in nomination other elements were listed but the stage was not. He said the original bandshell was built in 1912 to the objections of the Olmsteds. He said it was demolished in 1947 and the existing stage was built in 1974 and designed by Richard Haag.

Mr. Chalana arrived at 3:49 pm

He went over issues with the existing bandshell – non-compliant ADA, CPTED issues, no back stage to support performances, lack of roof, back area 4’ lower than the stage – and said they came to the conclusion that there is not enough of the original design left to salvage. He said the pathway will get as close to Olmsted path as possible and will be primary movement path. He said the pathway would increase openness of stage area. He said the new structure was designed with appended steel with center pivot door to provide backdrop for performances; when not in use the door folds back so space is visually open and there would be visual continuity to forest behind. He said three public restrooms face the path; there will be two backstage restrooms, and storage space on the side. He said they would retain the large Dogwood tree and add a few more plantings to enhance integration of stage into landscape.

Proposed materials include pigmented concrete for stage and within paths, composite rubber for stage floor, painted steel support elements, painted cement board panels for soffit area. Lighting would be minimized and integrated on back walls and above the restroom doors. Acoustic testing supports that design provides reflection back to performers.

He proposed enhancing plantings along the pathways and removing a couple trees one of which is exceptional but interferes with grading for accessibility.

He said the arborist said it is appropriate to move it and he noted it is in the new path. Vehicle access is needed to back of performance space; asphalt is proposed there. He said they have done community engagement and have broad community support for the project.

He said handrails will be painted black to match the new lilypond fences. He said the stage has a subtle slope so windblown rain will roll off.

Mr. Coney asked if the renderings are final.

Mr. Richards said yes. He proposed on back of support space wall a history wall that would provide history of the park. He said Jennifer Ott, Friends of Seattle Olmsted Parks will generate the text. He said the wall will also have space for donor recognition.

Mr. Barnes asked if there is wheelchair access to stage.

Mr. Richards indicated ramp on plan.

Mr. Chalana asked if Haag's stage will be gutted or if anything would be saved.

Mr. Richards said there is no feasible way to retain an of it. He said he thought Mr. Haag's grading was more significant that the structure.

Mr. Chalana asked if there is data about the safety issues.

Mr. Richards said the backstage restrooms are closed due to safety issues.

Kelly Goold, Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR) said there is no data but the restrooms have been closed for ten years. She said there has been a lot of negative activity there. She said the new restrooms will be opened with park and will be safer.

Jennifer Ott, FSOP, said with the redesign of Seattle Asian Art Museum, there are the only restrooms available in the park.

Mr. Kiel said the material sample callouts are different in drawings vs package.

Mr. Richards said it was corrected on color board and that he would update construction set.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Johnson said ARC discussed the existing stage and came to understand it couldn't be re-used in an influential way.

Mr. Kiel said Richard Haag didn't stand by this piece of work.

Mr. Chalana said it was not important by design so as not to compete with the glory of Olmsted design. The proposed design tries too hard and doesn't sit right in Olmstedian landscape. He said design won't cure all societal ills. He asked if they explored extending the existing stage.

Ms. Johnson said the existing stage is a Brutal building and doesn't reference Olmsted; it was of its time.

Mr. Chalana said it has been there 45 years and was designed by Richard Haag.

Ms. Wasserman said she lives nearby, and the current stage doesn't work well.

Mr. Macleod said the pivot door addresses safety and is an elegant design and he appreciated the attention given to bathroom design. He appreciated Mr. Chalana's comments that the stage is historic in its own right, but noted the stage is not adequate. He said the park deserves a more substantial piece of architecture.

Ms. Johnson said she has seen a number of forms and this design responded the most to the ARC feedback.

Mr. Kiel said the design was originally more ostentatious than this. He said this is something that functions.

Mr. Chalana said it is an artificial polarity; the existing one doesn't have to be torn down.

Mr. Kiel said the applicant demonstrated that retaining existing is not do-able, there is no meaning left. He said at the time the problems are solved, there is nothing left.

Mr. Coney said it is a fatigue factor with different groups all completing – ADA, concrete versus natural pathways. He said it has moved, evolved. It was not a plurality at ARC. He supported the new design and noted the existing one is not meeting programmatic needs. He said Rich Haag said to 'blow it up'.

Ms. Ott confirmed that Rich Haag did actually say 'blow it up'.

Mr. Coney said the design falls short and hasn't reached the point where he can support it. He noted the proposed steel versus stone that is there now and said the colored metal was not appropriate and should be a subtle dark color. He said to consider the effect to the park – extra things were thrown in – concrete, asphalt, railing in natural park. He asked if crushed gravel was considered for ADA access – it is permeable and non-petroleum product. He said to explore reconfiguring the path to reduce the grade. He did not support removal of trees or placement of donor plaques on public structures. He said the history could be elsewhere, not here.

Mr. Inpanbutr said they have gone through the process. He said it is a nice solution, opening up in the middle – he said he liked the openness. He asked if they considered regrading to avoid ADA handrails etc.

Mr. Richards said no, it seemed like more of an impact to the great lawn to have switch back ramps. He said most pathways in park are asphalt.

Mr. Macleod said programmatically it is good but it is too structured in the material palette; it seems like a commercial venue. He said the steel and lots of columns seems very heavy on the land.

Mr. Kiel said it is not large.

Mr. Chalana said it is the focal part of the meadow – you can't miss it and it doesn't belong there.

Mr. Inpanbutr said the roof structure is too heavy / grandiose and could be dialed down a bit, but the scale is appropriate.

Mr. Barnes said the steel and roof throw him off; the rest of the facilities in the park are stone. He said this doesn't fit the aesthetic of the park. He said it is not very functional. He said the bathrooms are dark areas and create a dark environment so it will be good to have them exposed and not secluded. He said he understood ADA needs and the asphalt is easier to push someone around in a wheelchair. He noted concern with the use of metal against a wood background.

Ms. Wasserman said if this was the first review, she would put it off, but discussion has been ongoing for five years and she supported taking the vote.

Ms. Johnson said the material needs to be something that can be maintained.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed demolition and replacement of the bandshell structure, and associated site alterations 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 location of the new structure maintains spatial relationships and is compatible with the size and scale of the landmarked Park, 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/HW/KJ 5:3:0 Messrs. Chalana, Coney, and Macleod opposed.

030420.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

030420.31 Roy Vue Apartments
615 Belmont Avenue E.
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty stated they are negotiating and working on language. She explained the request for 60 days extension.

MM/SC/RC/HW 8:0:0 Motion carried.

030420.32 Georgetown Steam Plant Pump House
7551 8th Avenue S.
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said she has prepared a draft for owners and they are reviewing it. She said they are discussing proposed revisions. She said they are tweaking language for administrative review. She said they asked for three-month extension.

MM/SC/IM/KJ 8:0:0 Motion carried.

030420.4 NOMINATIONS

030420.41 Swedish Club
1920 Dexter Avenue N.

Larry Johnson provided context of the site and neighborhood. Using photos, he conducted a virtual walk around the building and noted primary façade of the building with canopy extending westward. The southern façade overlooking the southern parking lot. The building has a the partial brise soleil

wrapping around the southern, eastern, and northern sides. He said the screen consists of cast aluminum segments. The screen is located approximately four feet from the exterior wall of the building allowing for egress stairways and pathways. He said the screen originally covered the entire southern and northern façades. He noted damaged to lower corner of building caused by careless loading and unloading. He said the eastern façade was originally solid concrete; four windows have been cut into exterior bays. He said the northern façade has missing screen elements on the eastern portion of the building. He said the northern side of the main entry is an intimate garden with a fountain. At the southern side of the main entry is another garden with a large stone of iron ore which was a gift from the Swedish Mining Company. He said the door pulls were a gift from the architect in memory of his father.

Mr. Johnson noted the interior two-story lobby and view from front entrance doorway, library, and meeting rooms and auditorium. He said the dining room takes up the northeastern portion with the lounge in the southern portion. He noted walkway on eastern side of floor and noted the stunning view of Lake Union.

Mr. Johnson said he would focus on design integrity. He said associations are still there, it is still associated with the Swedish Club. He said the architect intended for the building to be perceived as a brightly lit lantern on Queen Anne's slope, possibly inspired by Minoru Yamaski's Reynolds Aluminum building in Southfield, Michigan. He said when the building was constructed, not all the money had been raised to complete the structure, so compromises were made. Initially the building had no western entrance canopies while on the interior the elevator was left for a future project. The entrance canopy is heavier than originally planned. The drawings were signed by the architect. He said the architect intended a wraparound screen similar to the Reynolds Aluminum building but with an expanded metal panel. He said the original screen design was made up almost like a corrugated panel with pierced elements. He said somewhere along the line perhaps as a cost savings consideration, the architect revised the southern elevation drawing to be composed of interlocking components. At some time, the screen was removed down to handrail height on the eastern ends of the south and north façades. He said the screen was never installed on the east façade above the handrail height. He went over interior alterations and noted they were minor. He said the cloakroom was removed, windows opened up, walls added, wall removed, and the loss of some of the aluminum brise soleil, but noted that the building still has integrity to convey its significance for designation.

Mr. Johnson said the building did not meet criteria A or B as the associations were not significant. He said the hope was the building would be complete before the Century 21 Exposition, but the association with it was not significant. He said the building would not have been built without the efforts

of John Nordeen who was the club's manager at the time. He was an amateur comedian and a major booster, pulling the members together to fund the construction. He said the association was not significant enough to meet that Criterion.

Regarding Criterion C he said the nomination report marginally covers the development of the development of Westlake neighborhood, South Lake Union and Queen Anne Hill. He said because of its late development he didn't see the building having a significant association with development of those neighborhoods. He said the Swedish Club was and is a significant component of the City's cultural heritage and character of the City. Developed by a group of male Swedish immigrants in 1892. As a social club, the men needed a meeting place. Construction of the first club house was around 1905. He said that other immigrant groups formed groups and they were usually around mutual aid with social secondary. He said the Swedish Club has always been a social organization. Among the founders of the club were men who contributed to the greater community: founder of Swedish Hospital in 1910; and playing key roles in the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition. After the regrade the industrious Swedes scooped out the basement and turned the structure into a three-story building with a brick veneer. The building became a hub for the social activity for the Swedish community. The club was exclusively a men's club until 1989. The ladies auxiliary club was always ready to lend a hand.

By 1940 the club had grown but the building was beginning to look worn and outdated and the members began talking about a new facility. He said what really prompted the action was when the Sons of Norway built a clubhouse on the western side of Queen Anne hill in the early 1950s. He said Nordeen, being the club's manager led the effort to construct a new clubhouse. He started out thinking big attempting to unite the various other Swedish organizations, but it became clear that the club would have to scale back its vision. The club was offered a site overlooking Lake Union on Dexter Avenue N. and hired one of its members, Einar Anderson of the Seattle Architecture firm Steinhart, Theriault and Anderson to design their new building. He said there was a big boost to have the building completed by the start of the Century 21 Exposition. The top floor featured a restaurant featuring Scandinavian specialties. An early photo shows the eastern wall as solid and said the panels have all been replaced by glass. He said the building qualifies for landmark designation under Criterion C because of its close association with the Swedish Club, a significant cultural element associated with City's early development.

Regarding Criterion D he noted elements of the International Style including the glass expanses spanning between exposed structural frames, floating planes for roofs and floors, experimentation with use of new materials and methods of construction, an open interior plan and lack of applied

ornamentation. He said most of these elements are seen in the subject building. He said it is unfair to compare the subject building to some of the archetypes of the Modern movement such as Bauhaus' Walter Gropius and Mies van der Rohe. He noted the Crown Hall which was completed four years after the subject building. He said it is fair to compare it to the Reynolds Metal Building by Minoru Yamasaki in Southfield, Michigan which was completed the year before this one and used the same aluminum brise soleil screens. He said both buildings were intended to light up like a shimmering jewel at night. He was not saying Anderson copied Yamasaki but he was probably influenced by widely published information. He said a few years later Yamasaki built the first of two towers on the University Tract for the Century 21 Exposition. He said for the nomination report he brought up Scandinavian examples, but he couldn't find design influences that might be expected for a building associated with Scandinavian immigrants. He noted the popularity of the brise soleil at the time it was built and noted there were several local examples. He said the building may meet Criterion D and noted its derivative elements of the International Style.

Mr. Johnson said the building did meet Criterion E for Einar Anderson, Steinhart, Theriault, and Anderson, who was one of the premier architectural offices in the Pacific Northwest. Anderson was a member of the Swedish Club. Anderson passed away in 1970 at the age of 45. He said their firm was responsible for dozens of notable northwest buildings including residences, schools, banks, commercial, community, and religious buildings. He said schools were modern structures with breezeways with most in the suburbs during a time of rapid development following WWII. He said Shoreline Community College is a notable example. He said banks were designed as modern buildings built for a variety of uses. He provided photos of a few of the firm's buildings and noted their design work was extensive.

Mr. Johnson said the building meets Criterion F because it is visible and showed photos of views of the building.

Mr. Coney asked what the floor material was.

Mr. Johnson said concrete slabs; originally it was clad in vinyl tile.

Owner Comment:

Christine Leander, Executive Director of Swedish Club, said they supported nomination of the building and immediate site, but not the two parking lots.

Susan Boyle, BOLA said the building was to be part of a larger Scandinavian Center that did not come to fruition. She said the parking lots will be developed separately; they are accessory to building only. She noted the driveway is off Dexter – it is too steep and not to Code. She said the original

specs on the screening called for expanded metal called Arborweave which was cheaper. She said the cast aluminum rings is similar but has a greater elegance. She said the canopy is an addition from the 1970s; it is not original.

Mr. Macleod asked how the rings were produced.

Ms. Boyle said they are a Reynolds product.

Mr. Coney asked if there was any material left over.

Ms. Boyle said a piece was found in the building.

Mr. Macleod asked if there was a connection to Ibsen Nelson.

Ms. Boyle said no.

Public Comment:

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society said he agreed with the Staff Report. He said you need to see the building in person. He noted the main room, open space and wonderful stairs. He said it is an elegant space that should be designated. He said the Rainier Tower project has been stepped back to protect views of Rainier Tower. He said views of the Swedish Club from the south should likewise be protected.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society supported nomination. She said it is unique Mid-Century architecture and she noted the rich Swedish cultural heritage. She said it sits on one parcel – the nominated parcel – but the view from the public right of way is important. She said the parking lots will be developed.

Gary Sohn, President of Swedish Club Board, supported nomination and said he loves the building.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle supported nomination and said it is a special building. He supported including Criterion F and said the south elevation is the most prominent. He said he supported including the view of the building from the south. He spoke on behalf of Eugenia Woo, Docomomo WeWa who also supported nomination.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Chalana supported nomination and to include exterior, lobby, view shed from south, and the historic association with people of Swedish heritage. He said to ensure development of parking will not diminish view.

Mr. Coney supported nomination and to included interior, exterior, view component, fountain, and whole parcel except for disconnected parking lot. He asked for more information on any link to Yamasaki.

Ms. Wasserman supported nomination and inclusion of interior; she noted the stairway. She said the view is important.

Mr. Kiel said to include the site; the parking lot is not important, just the view.

Mr. Inpanbutr supported nomination of interior, exterior, and site.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and noted the screen, Swedish Club, architect as significant. She did not support inclusion of parking lot. She said there are other ways to deal with view.

Mr. Barnes supported nomination including the interior, exterior, landscape, fountain, and rock.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination. He said the screen qualifies it for Criterion F. He said the nomination is expansive and he expected to see it pared back at designation meeting.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Swedish Club at 1920 Dexter Avenue North for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the interior of the building, the exterior of the building, and the entire site; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 15, 2020; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RC/MC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

030420.42 Northgate Elementary School
11725 1st Avenue NE

Richard Best, Seattle Public Schools explained they are going through process to establish status of building. He noted concern of students and stakeholders and said the building does not meet current needs of educational program. He said he agreed with the Staff Report, that it is not nominated.

Public Comment:

Abigail Fowler, parent noted issues of equity, income and race. She said students come from diverse backgrounds and challenges. A new building will change educational outcomes.

Feben Ghirmatzion did not support nomination. The school is old and not in great shape. She wanted a new school and said the kids need to see something new and grand.

Linda Sinni, Northgate ES Teacher said the building is not nice. She said they talked with parents about what they want for their kids. She said to look at values presented – a white man’s building or one that educates and values marginalized population of kids.

Randy Harkness said he went there as a child. He did not support nomination.

Ellen Mirro, TJP provided context of the site and neighborhood. She provided a virtual ‘walk around’ the building and noted portable classrooms to the south, playfield to the north. She said the entry is on the east façade. She said that all windows have been replaced on the building with exception of those on the west façade. She said that interior changes have been made to the library, auditorium/lunchroom, and connection corridor. She said the building was constructed in the post WWII boom and was closed in 1976; it was reopened following a court ruling. She said the south section of the play yard wall is gone, in 2000 a computer lab was added, and the library was revamped. She noted replacement of relites and windows and consolidation of classrooms. She said building systems are degraded and the building condition fails to meet needs of children it serves.

Katie Jaeger, TJP said the building doesn’t meet criteria A, B, or C. She said it only tangentially meets C as it relates to Northgate and a normal part of school and neighborhood development. She noted the nearby liq ted Springs site which is a sacred site to Native Americans. She said in the 1930s the area was mostly farmland. In 1954 Seattle annexed the area. She noted the 1962 impact to the area of I-5 construction. She said the non-white population increased.

Regarding Criterion D, Ms. Mirro said the Moderne and Mid-Century Modern typology evolved for school design. She noted the use of the design for lighting. She said at Cedar Park school the roof is more elegant and there is more efficient use of space. She noted the separate functions differentiated by roof forms. She noted Thiry’s use of precast elements. She said the school falls short and cited Ingraham High School and Cedar Park as better examples of the style. She said that Paul Thiry is the father of Pacific Northwest Modernism. He designed churches, the Frye Art Museum, Key Arena among other better examples of his work. She said the building didn’t meet criteria D, E, or F.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary said the building did not meet criteria. She said here the focus is on equity and this site has the second highest need of equity. She said 54 for letters were received, none in support of nomination.

Mr. Chalana asked if Thiry's Cedar Park continues as a school.

Ms. Mirro said it was used as an art community for a while.

Ms. Clawson said Our Lady of the Lake still does.

Mr. Kiel asked if the wall in the courtyard is original.

Ms. Mirro said it is.

Public Comment:

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle said Thiry was the father of Pacific Northwest Modernism. He noted the purity of forms. He introduced new methods of construction and explored new technologies. He noted Native American design and the influence of long house structure on design. He said the north section has the pure long gabled form. He noted the differentiated windows from frame. He said that condition does not equal integrity. He said each building stands on its own. He said the building has adaptive potential and meets criteria D and D.

Shery Grater said Haller Lake Community Club did not support nomination and said there is no neighborhood support for it either.

Braxton Ehle did not support nomination and said it is not adaptable or useful.

Dedy Fautleroy, Northgate ES Principal said they are missing the equity piece. She said the kids are hard-working and diverse. She said it is cold in the building all day and kids deserve a better building. She appreciated the architecture but cited current history and diversity as more important. She said Thiry has many amazing examples of his work; this one can go.

Guillermo Carvajal said it is too cold in the portable. He said the style doesn't reflect progressive ideal's Thiry expressed. He said there are better examples. He said even if gutted, the building is a dinosaur and a new building is needed. He said the place is referred to as the last place for kids before prison. A new building brings new belief systems and represents what Northgate is becoming.

Peter Maier did not support nomination. It is not an outstanding work of Thiry; the building has been altered, and it doesn't serve the needs of the school.

Lisa Schaefer, parent and neighbor said she agrees with all of the comments.

Celeste Latorre did not support nomination and said Thiry would probably agree that the space doesn't serve the need anymore.

Krisanne Heinze, PTO did not support nomination; the school doesn't meet the needs and doesn't represent the neighborhood.

Priscilla Allen did not support nomination and noted electrical and plumbing issues and said it would be difficult to remodel the building.

Megan Hosch-Schmitt did not support nomination although she appreciated Mid-century Modern style. She said the appearance and comparison to other nicer schools impacts reputation. There is stigma attached to building.

Benjamin Barber, Northgate ES Art Teacher said the space informs how education happens. The ghosts of the past need to be left behind.

Kate Eads, Northgate ES Librarian did not support nomination. She noted the power and privilege of the board. She said she has removed classics from the shelf as they don't serve their students.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Wasserman said the board can't talk about everything and must stick to the criteria. She asked staff why a Thiry building was not recommended for nomination.

Ms. Doherty said she didn't believe it met the standards. She said she toured the facility and the building is not an outstanding piece of Thiry's work. She said Cedar Park is a better building and shows a development of design.

Mr. Inpanbutr did not support nomination although he appreciated Mr. Murdock's comments. He said the building could be renovated but it would be difficult to say it meets the standards.

Ms. Johnson appreciated hearing public comments and said the board must consider the criteria for designation. She said Thiry is important, but this building doesn't rise to the standard.

Mr. Barnes did not support nomination. He said Thiry has other, better buildings that show his expertise.

Mr. Chalana said the building still qualifies on criteria D and E; it embodies the Mid-Century Modern style. He said it still has integrity. He said it is a great example of Thiry's work and said it is a false comparison to compare works. He said if it doesn't meet the functional needs, it is not the building's fault; build something new. He said the board considers criteria. He supported nomination.

Mr. Coney said nomination is part of the meeting. He noted the structure and architecture and current integrity. He said it is clear to see the progression of his career. He said it was the vernacular example of the era and style. He said the board separates criteria from emotion. He said a new building is needed elsewhere.

Mr. Macleod said there is lots of emotion and he was as yet undecided. He appreciated public comment. He said he went to multiple schools that had outlived their use. He said this meeting is about the architecture itself. He said he was less interested in Thiry as it is not an outstanding example of his work. He said the building is an example of how architecture responded to huge population boom coinciding with limited funds and how cities coped with that. He said he was on the fence but leaned toward nomination.

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination and said the building doesn't meet the criteria. He said it is not a good example of Thiry's work; outstanding work demands comparison to other examples. He said there was a great irony of ideals of Modernism and function over form that neither is being met. He said the thing that underpins the style is no longer true.

Mr. Chalana said it is a false dichotomy of new versus old. He said it is not the board's job to address equity. He said it doesn't have to be beautiful to be historic. He said it represents a trajectory of his work.

Ms. Wasserman and Messrs. Coney and Inpanbutr said they did not support nomination.

Mr. Macleod said he saw both arguments and that he would not support nomination.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Northgate Elementary School at 11725 1st Avenue NE as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not meet any of the designation standards, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/KJ/DB 7:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Chalana opposed.

030420.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator