



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 100/20

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday February 19, 2020 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Manish Chalana
Roi Chang
Russell Coney
Ian Macleod
Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Matt Inpanbutr

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

021920.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 20, 2019

MM/SC/RC/IM 3:0:2 Minutes approved. Mmes. Chang and Wasserman abstained.

Mr. Chalana arrived at 3:35 pm.

021920.2 NOMINATIONS

021920.21 1101 E. Pike Street

Tom Heuser, Adam Alsobrook, and Marvin Anderson presented. (full report in DON file).

Ms. Chang disclosed her previous employer was tenant in the building.

Ms. Wasserman disclosed she is a member of the Capitol Hill Historical Society; she was not involved in the nomination application.

Neither the property owner nor Board members objected to their participation.

Liz Dunn stated she is a co-owner and that she hoped the building would be designated. She said it is an important building.

Tom Heuser provided context of the site and neighborhood. He provided an overview of the automobile history and showroom / garage services. The subject building was built in 1916 as an automobile showroom, garage, and service building. He said the first occupant of the building was Henry Grant, Seattle Automobile Company. Architect Sønke E. Sønnichsen designed the building in the Commercial or Chicago School style. The primary massing of the building consists of a three-story main volume built over a full basement. The primary structure of the building is heavy timber mill construction, load bearing brick, with a reinforced concrete foundation. It contains a partial mezzanine level on the first and second floors; a penthouse contains elevator overrun and exit stairway. The northwest corner of the subject building is curved, which is an unusual feature for a commercial building during this time period, particularly in Seattle. This curved form recalls the corner entrance rotunda of the Carson-Pirie-Scott Building in Chicago (Louis H. Sullivan, 1899-1904), while at the same time foreshadowing building forms of the Streamline Moderne style of the late 1920s and 1930s. This curved corner entrance distinguished the building from the other automobile showroom and service buildings in the area and most likely attracted both the attention of automobile drivers and riders on the streetcar line that once ran along Pike Street. Sønnichsen reprised the curved building corner and entrance pavilion form in his design for the Bekins Moving and Storage Building a few blocks away at the southwest corner of 12th Avenue North and East Madison Street.

Mr. Heuser provided comparison of 1916 and 2019 photos of the building and noted the building has been well-maintained after more than a century of use. The red and white glazed tile appears to be original as do the center pivot and upper hopper style transom windows which remain operable to this day. The original brackets below the original transom windows remain but otherwise the original wood doors have been replaced by aluminum double doors. He

said the north elevation has fire escape, white tile, transom windows, wainscoting all appear original. He said east stairwell and doorway as well as window mullions have been added and the bulkhead altered. There used to be a gas pump out in front of the building.

He again provided comparison of 1919 and 2019 photos of building. He said the two-colored terrazzo floor appears to be original. The painted wood panel wainscoting at the columns and the pilasters between the windows also appears to be original. Otherwise the mezzanine windows, ground office, and original light fixtures have been removed. He said the restaurant space was previously the service entrance for the automobiles and the metal doors appear to be original. He said the second floor was originally used for auto parts and repair and is currently divided into office spaces. He said brick balls mostly at the perimeter are exposed. He said the floors and ceilings are supported by heavy timber columns. He said the floors finishes vary and are laid on top of original cardecking. He said Steel 'I' beam ledgers at the south wall of the building span from column to column and support the ends of the car decking where it meets the exterior brick masonry wall. Lintels for the window openings at the north and west perimeter walls are sections of steel 'I' beams, and the beams for the windows at the curved corner entrance pavilion are curved to support the weight of the brick masonry walls above the corner windows. The third floor was used for storing used cars and is now used for office space. The heavy timber beams have been sandblasted and exposed and existing floor finishes are a combination of carpet and painted strip wood flooring laid on top of the car decking.

Mr. Heuser talked about the development of the Pike Pine area starting with European settlers' plats. Development of the area increased after the great fire and with the expansion of the streetcar line. He noted boom related to gold rush. Additional amenities followed. Between 1903 and 1910 Pike and Pine streets were regraded by the City for easier access. The area quickly changed from wood frame single family residences to commercial development.

He said the development of the automobile showroom in Seattle and noted the first attempts at automobile retail sales occurred in small retail units typically with more vertically oriented or recessed window bays. Cars were not put on display and were shown in catalogs with the exception of Gifford and Grant who had a couple cars stored in the basement. In 1905 the first custom designed space for automobile sales was built at 5th and Madison. He noted the ramps to accommodate display models and service access. He said next came the livery style which started between 1906 and 1907. By this time automobiles had become abundant in Seattle, but majority of owners had no place to store them. He said to meet the demand for auto storage, buildings were designed exclusively to store them and were based on design of livery buildings. He noted buildings at 1414 Broadway and 1425 10th Avenue as examples of the period.

Mr. Heuser described the densely decorated brick façade and arched windows and the one larger passageway for vehicles. He said the building bears some resemblance to Union Stables at 2200 Western Avenue and Rainier Stables at 2100 Western Avenue; both are still standing. He said that given Grant had lived near those buildings years prior, it is likely he was inspired by their designs. Starting around 1909 the third phase, the ornate phase, buildings had large porticos and elaborate ornamentation both inside and out. He said the details drew attention to the building and reflected luxury. He said early buildings in this phase include the Motor Car Agency (Pierce Arrow) at Union and Broadway and Nute & Keena Packard Dealership on the corner of Belmont and Pike, both one-story brick buildings with large plate glass viewing windows and smaller-paned transom above. J. W. Leavitt Company (Monique Lofts) is an early example. The following year the subject building was built with its unique corner, perhaps its most defining feature. By 1917 when the White Company Showroom was built at 1021 E Pine (Julian Everett, Seattle Landmark), terra cotta ornamentation had come into favor, and reached perhaps its most elaborate expression in an automobile showroom at the Ford McKay Building on Mercer Street (Harlan Thomas and Clyde Granger, 1922) .

By the 1920s automobiles had been widely adopted and a variety of other auto service buildings emerged, including filling stations, tire stores, and independent service stations. Increasing density in the neighborhood combined with the desire by dealers to display multiple car models and the incorporation of both vehicle service and storage pushed showroom buildings to three and four stories, built in either heavy mill (timber) construction or reinforced concrete and services by large, heavy duty freight elevators. Automobile showrooms dispersed and, as architectural styles shifted, became more streamlined while retaining their large windows and *au courant* ornamentation. The 1948 S.L. Savidge dealership at 2021 Ninth (now Washington Talking Book and Braille Library) is perhaps Seattle's finest example of an Art Deco automobile showroom. By the 1940s, automobile showrooms had largely decamped to suburbia where land was available for large lots and sprawling showrooms.

The original building owner, Mary Liebeck, was a single mother who had boarding houses in Fremont and went on to buy multiple houses in Capitol Hill. She started to develop properties into commercial buildings including the subject building. Seattle had a high number of female real estate agents and had the first known cooperative.

Marvin Anderson said that Architect Sønke Sønnichsen was born in Norway and came to the United States in 1902 and arrived in Seattle in 1905. He worked for Summerville and Cote; and moved to Vancouver B.C. in 1910. Due to economic issues he returned to Seattle. He designed the Sons and

Daughters of Norway building in 1914. Many of his Seattle projects were Norwegian property owners. He said that because Grant was Norwegian, it is likely that Grant and not Liebeck who brought in Sønnichsen. His projects included apartments, single family houses, commercial projects, industrial buildings. In 1923-24 he moved to Los Angeles, California and then to San Francisco. He partnered with Marcus B. Priteca and they collaborated on many theaters, hotels, and apartments. Sønnichsen also did smaller projects on his own. He worked on many military projects and houses during WWII. Later he moved to Baltimore to become a naval architect. He moved back to Seattle and worked again with Priteca for the rest of his career.

Mr. Heuser said there were three phases of occupancy starting with automotive from 1916 – 1937, textiles from 1939 – 1994, and art and architecture from 1990 on. He said to save time he would focus on Grant's involvement with the auto industry. He said that Henry Grant was active in the Seattle bike riding community and later brought possibly one of the first gasoline powered vehicles to the City – gas powered bicycle. He facilitated the first automobile sale in the City. Grant co-founded the first business devoted to the automobile, the Seattle Automobile Company which was the first of its type locally to promote sales of cars, create a licensing process, and build good public roads. He is likely the person who brought Sønnichsen in to design the subject building and was thought to be a contributor to the design. He emphasized customer education. Commercial Linen Company, 1943-53 was another notable tenant in this building. It was originally founded in 1921 by Louis Nickols, Senior. It was the wholesale linen division of the Nickols Manufacturing Company, makers of home dresses and aprons founded a year earlier. Throughout the 1920s, the Commercial Linen Company grew extensively under their leadership and became their primary operation by 1930. Despite poor economic conditions, business continued to grow throughout the 1930s including large contracts with Mutual Groceries and Vance Hotel. The company moved to the subject area becoming the first linen manufacturing company to do so. Its address, 1517-1521 10th Avenue, is now home to Elliott Bay Book Company about a block and half from the subject building. The business was sold to Benjamin Barlin in 1944 and they business moved to the subject building. Little information about the business under Barlin's ownership could be found. In Barlin's absence, Norwood Nickols regained control of the company in 1951 and sold all its assets (except the building which still belonged to Barlin) to H.W. Baker Linen Company of New York two years later. In 1980 the company merged with the H.W. Baker Linen Company of New Jersey, sold the subject building to a group known as "Center 68", and last occupied the building in 1983. Nineteen years later, Best Manufacturing Group purchased the Baker Linen Company of New Jersey.

He said the building is exceptionally fine and well-maintained. It is an example of a master architect's work and represents the savvy and business acumen of a Seattle woman realtor. The building played a pivotal role in

Seattle's auto row history and is representative of one of the City's significant auto executives.

Mr. Coney asked how they got cars to the third floor.

Mr. Heuser said there was a freight elevator.

Ms. Barker asked to explain the bulkhead changes.

Mr. Anderson clarified it appears to have a wainscoting paneling indicating on photo.

Mr. Coney asked about clear glass at transom.

Mr. Alsobrook said they did not do a window survey.

Ms. Dunn clarified that all glazing is original unless it was broken and needed to be replaced.

Public Comment:

Dennis Saxman commended the presenters on thoroughness of report. He said Grant is important and did sell first car in Seattle. He said he thinks the corner and layout is character-defining of auto row buildings. He said windows were clear to allow for maximum light. He said chauffeurs used to meet on upper floors in the 1920s. He supported the nomination.

Tamara Bunnell supported nomination on criteria C, D, and E and would submit a letter for the record.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said the building meets criteria C, D, E, and F. It stands out in the neighborhood and has presence. She said she appreciated the owners' stewardship. She supported nomination and ultimately designation.

John Fight, Pike Pine Urban Neighborhood Council (P-PUNC) supported nomination and said the building has presence and has architectural merit.

Cathy Hillenbrandt said the building is a keystone building in the neighborhood. She said that Criterion F applies.

Mike Malone said he owns several landmarked buildings. He supported nomination and noted the strong architectural integrity. He noted it has had so few owners and is in good condition. He said the owner is a perfect steward.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Coney said he appreciated public comment. He was happy to see the original windows were still there. He supported nomination of exterior only.

Mr. Macleod said he was intrigued by the layers of cultural history; first auto retailer in the City, the association with women in real estate development, and early auto history for the City. He said criteria C, D, E and F are applicable and supported nomination of exterior only. He wanted to know more about women realtors.

Ms. Wasserman said she loves the building and appreciates its history. She said the building commands your attention. She supported nomination of the exterior and said that criteria C, D, E, and F are relevant.

Ms. Chang supported nomination and said that criteria C, D, and E were relevant and with discussion on F. She supported exterior only per staff recommendation.

Mr. Chalana supported nomination and said it is a fine example of auto row building. He noted the mature architectural design. He supported criteria C and D and F but said he was not sure about E as it relates to Sønnichsen. He said he didn't want to weigh in on exclusion of interior without more discussion. He clarified he didn't need more information on Sønnichsen.

Mr. Coney said he would like a bit more information on the other owners.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and appreciated the presentation and illustrations of then and now are extremely helpful. She said Grant's history is intriguing. She supported inclusion of interior and including Criterion F.

Mr. Alsbrook noted that Mr. Anderson went to Minnesota and went through Sønnichsen's archives.

Mr. Chalana said that given that information he supported Criterion E. He said that women's history has been left out and should be a part of this building's story.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of 1101 E. Pike Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the building interior and exterior; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 1, 2020; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RC/HW 6:0:0 Motion carried.

021920.22 909 E. Pine Street

Full report in DON file.

Rhoda Lawrence provided context of the site and neighborhood. She said the building is also called the Hamlin Building and the “Little Eitel Building”. She said the URM building was originally owned by Edward J. Hamlin who was a salmon broker and wholesale grocer. This was an investment property; he owned the building two years. She said the building is in a mixed-use neighborhood and is owned by Seattle College.

She said the architect was Victor Voorhees who designed more than 110 properties and prominent buildings. She said that Voorhees standardized house plans and designed a wide range of buildings including residences, apartment buildings, retail and commercial buildings and auto showrooms among others. He said he designed the subject building in the middle of his career and said that there are other buildings of his design that were less modest.

She provided general historic context of Capitol Hill noting that the previous report provided detail. She said the area was logged in 1880s and in 1891 a trolley linked Capitol Hill, First Hill and Beacon Hill. She said the development of auto row began in 1906 and this building comes in at the end. She said that auto row buildings were clustered along Broadway. She said that auto row related buildings appeared – repair, parts, painting, and used car dealers – in fireproof structures. She said that many dealerships were in ornate buildings and noted the White Motor Company and the Packard dealership.

She said that Capitol Hill today is a thriving community, home to the LGBTQ community, bars, restaurants, culture. She said that the subject building is a two-story, flat-roofed structure with unreinforced brick masonry perimeter walls and post and beam interior on a concrete foundation. She said it has a small footprint. She said original peaked parapet and pilaster were removed and changed the character of the building. She said originally the first floor was open. It is a modest commercial building, and the primary north façade is characterized by large, rectangular openings and a dark red rug brick finish. Subtle brick patterning consists of several continuous soldier courses above the second-story windows, along with a row of basket weave. Other elevations are primarily common brick and common bond. Minimal openings on two other sides, some of which have been infilled. The building retains its upper floor true divided lights and transoms. The transoms on the first floor have been altered. There is new aluminum sash and changes to the steps and openings. Rug textured brick is subtle patterning; it is well-executed but not unusual or unique in design. The interior is pretty utilitarian and functional.

She said that it is clear that the building is associated with the broad pattern of auto-related buildings. However, the modern changes to the building's original simple design quality, particularly the removal of the peaked parapet and storefront that indicated its original auto-related character has resulted in loss of physical integrity and does not appear to meet the Criteria for designation.

Mr. Chalana asked about when changes were made to the parapet.

Ms. Lawrence said she didn't know; maybe it was a seismic event.

Mr. Coney asked if interior framing is wood and heavy timber.

Ms. Lawrence said it is likely with some demising walls but otherwise wood. She said the timbers are concealed.

Mr. Coney asked about architect.

Ms. Lawrence said it was Victor Voorhees who has designed other buildings in the City.

Mr. Coney asked about ownership history.

Ms. Lawrence said many were auto related but she could look it up.

Mr. Macleod asked if the building was built speculatively.

Ms. Lawrence said it was built for Triangle Electricians, which was auto related. She said that at one point, Pontiac and Studebaker each occupied the building.

Mr. Chalana asked about integrity.

Ms. Lawrence said the upper windows and upper transoms are original. The line of transoms at the first floor are original. The other ones have been replaced. The garage doors that were on the east side have been changed out and the ones that have been in there are anodized aluminum. The one on the east side was originally a recess.

Mr. Chalana said that the openings are still there.

Ms. Lawrence said they openings are still there and the masonry are still there but there are some infill elements on the first floor.

Ms. Barker asked about alterations to the back alterations per page 2 floor plan. It shows the entrance off of Pine but doesn't show entrance through to south or to back. In 1959 picture you can just look through to parking lot alley space; were the doors open on the south and then filled in.

Ms. Lawrence said on the south façade there is a double door.

There was confusion about which drawing they were each talking about so they re-oriented to correct version.

Ms. Barker asked about south façade door and asked if there was an original window.

Ms. Lawrence said that one has a transom over it and if you look at the one to the south and the west side has stone lintels.

Ms. Barker asked if it is original or if it had been infilled some.

Ms. Lawrence said it has a solid panel and a man door.

Ms. Barker asked for clarification when it might have been added.

Ms. Lawrence said it might have been punched through.

There was a question if Capitol Hill Housing was a tenant.

Ms. Lawrence said that it was purchased by Seattle Central College who used it as administrative space and class facilities.

Ms. Wasserman disclosed that she is a former employee of Seattle Central College but that she left over three years ago. She said she has been in and around the building. She said it used to be a florist shop.

Public Comment:

Dennis Saxman supported nomination and said he believes it is intact and worthy of support. He said the building is reusable which is great. He was concerned about drawings – he never remembers seeing a parapet or seeing the building called an auto building. The fenestration is typical of auto row buildings – lots of light. It is not Oddfellows Building but it was important to view neighborhood as a hold. There are more important buildings that were not landmarked. But this should be landmarked; interior cladding would find typical auto row features. This was once part of the neighborhood. If you are going to land in 1921 this was part of real estate sale performed by important realtor.

Elaine Wiley, Gender Justice League said they support mission of Youthcare. She said she didn't think this, or the Booth Building have historical significance. Designation would impact Youthcare from acquiring the building and serving youth and LGBTQ community.

Mike Malone said this building has a long relationship with the Booth Building and 909 which should also be a landmark. He said the building is only 40 feet wide. It connects to Oddfellows which is important. If torn down, they will squish something between two beautiful buildings. He doesn't appreciate bad design. He said it helps to knit the block together with the Oddfellows Building to the East.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle supported nomination. Great to see diversity of auto row from high style to more 'lowbrow' side. They all tell the story. He said brick detail represents Victor Voorhees hand. He said he thinks these buildings help to tell the auto row story and are very nice and also shows Voorhees' talent.

Liz Dunn said she supports Youthcare program. She said that the fabric of this block is important. She asked if there is a way to carry on the program without demolition of the building.

Ms. Sodt clarified that the board should not consider future development but has to look at condition and Standards and integrity.

Maria Barrientos, developer of project said she did not support nomination and that the building did not meet the standards or have integrity. She said the presentation was clear on that.

Meghan Twitch did not support nomination.

Beau August said he supported Youthcare said the building did not meet the standards and doesn't feel like a landmark.

Ms. Sodt clarified that the conservation district overlay is SDCI's purview.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Chalana said he was conflicted. He supported the mission of the agency that works with LGBTQ youth but that he thought the building has something to consider further. He supported nomination and he wanted more information about owners, tenants, history, and he asked for better images. He said he wants to understand the interiors.

Ms. Chang said it could be eligible but there was a lack of information. She said the building fits with the auto row style and construction as do many in the corridor. She said she was interested if Voorhees did other smaller buildings similar to this in the neighborhood. She supported nomination.

Ms. Wasserman did not support nomination. She agreed that putting a new building there in that space is something they should not consider but knows future use is not considered. She said there is nothing left inside. She said she didn't think the building conveys its significance.

Mr. Macleod was conflicted but that he supported nomination. He said it is not a glamorous building, but it is part of auto row story. He wanted to know more about smaller buildings of this size and scale in neighborhood – garages, manufacturing buildings.

Mr. Coney supported nomination. He said the board does not have purview over use and future use does not have bearing on this decision. He said the building reminded him of the Bressi Garage. He said it is an important vernacular structure and he thinks it has integrity. He said it is remarkably intact. He said the loss of parapet and pilasters do not detract from it.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and said she is a fan of vernacular architecture and of Voorhees' work. She said it shows Voorhees' attention to detail. She said it is a dignified building. She said the changes do not impact the building. She said she was disappointed in the presentation; it is a modest charming building which could have been sold a bit more.

Mr. Macleod said he wants to know more about parapet change and date. He asked to see changes made by Seattle Central College. He said the transom window is still sitting there.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of 909 E. Pike Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the building exterior; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 1, 2020; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/IM/RC 5:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Wasserman opposed.

021920.23

Booth Building
1534 Broadway Avenue

Rhoda Lawrence, BOLA provided context of the neighborhood and site. The commercial mixed-use building is owned by Seattle Community College. She said the three-story concrete unreinforced masonry (URM) building is clad and painted in stucco. The original owners, the Booth brothers were born in New Orleans and developed the building as an investment. Architects Thompson and Thompson designed the building, they practiced until 1927. Their practice was a versatile one with experience in many styles and ability to respond to the fashion of the time. The firm designed residences, apartment buildings, and commercial buildings. The Booth Building was in the early part of their practice.

Ms. Lawrence provided an overview of the history of Capitol Hill and said the streetcars encouraged development as transit corridors opened up. She said music and arts education was happening all over the country; Columbia College of Music was a tenant in the Booth Building. She said Columbia College of Music occupied the building for two years before they moved to the Oddfellows Building next door.

Nellie Cornish was an early music tenant. She studied at University of Washington and in 1944 occupied the Booth Building. She was a music instructor in the early 1900s. She started the Cornish School of Music; in 1915 there were 85 students and a growing faculty with a plan for integrated curriculum for arts and she took over the third floor. She said the school grew exponentially. By 1919 they were busting at the seams. After seven years she moved out of the Booth Building and into her own building. She said Cornish College of the Arts is highly respected. The Booth Building continued to be used for arts and dance.

Ms. Lawrence said the building is in the Mission Revival Style and noted the curved parapet, square towers, stucco, some surface ornament and iron railings, fixtures and arched support. Other local examples of this style include the Fremont Library, L'Amourita, and Brasa buildings. Originally the building had many features of the Mission Revival style including pyramid roof, parapets, rafter tails but that has changed over time. Originally there were three wood storefronts and miscellaneous awnings. She said Mission Revival style is strong at the upper level and the standard wood storefronts are incongruous. She said there have been changes to storefronts, parapets have been removed, as have the cartouches and windowsill accents.

Ms. Lawrence said there has been extensive interior changes particularly in 1960-64 for a bank tenant; aluminum storefronts were installed, and wood windowsills were removed. Seattle Central College occupied the building but has since vacated it. Via photos she indicated changes on each façade. She said exposed signage was removed and has impacted the look of the building. She said the tile floor at entrance remains. She said in 2006 a neighborhood survey listed this building as not a contender for landmark status because of the alterations and removal of defining features. She said there is no association with heritage and the association with Cornish is better captured elsewhere. She said no criteria were met.

Ms. Wasserman disclosed that she was the IT Director at Seattle Central College and has familiarity with the building, but noted she is retired and not involved with any part of the project.

Neither the owner nor the Board objected to her participation.

Ms. Chalana asked about changes to plaster detail.

Ms. Lawrence said it is indicated on photos. She said the scalloped parapet and cartouches are gone as well. The bracketed windowsills were removed, and the stucco finished has been plastered over time.

Ms. Barker asked if they had any building permits.

Ms. Lawrence said no.

Ms. Chang asked if this was the first arts building in the City.

Ms. Lawrence said no, there were others. This was not specifically designed as a music education venue.

Mr. Chalana asked which other buildings are a better legacy to Cornish.

Ms. Lawrence said Cornish was in the Booth Building from 1914 – 1921; after that, Carey Hall, and the Lenora Square Building.

Public Comment:

Melinda Givengo, CEO Youth Corps, said they plan to renovate the building for homeless youth and asked the board not to landmark the building.

Maria Barrientos, developer said the building doesn't meet any landmark criteria; it meets no threshold and is not worthy of landmark designation due to alterations.

Dennis Saxman supported nomination, noting association with historic events – Nellie Cornish and Cornish stood out to him. On the second floor the Broadway Chauffer and Mechanics classes were held there; Triangle Electrical rotated in this building. He said to explore the building's connection to auto row.

Cathryn did not support nomination; Booth Building was not designed a music studio and it is not the first. Cornish was only there temporarily. The façade changes are significant and the building has no integrity or character.

Toby Addington, Youth Care did not support nomination although he said he believed in arts for young people.

Hilary Keyes did not support nomination. She said she has a theatre education, and this is not a historic building. She said the building is altered and has no merit.

Tamara Bennel, Capitol Hill Historical Society supported nomination and said the building met criteria B, C, D, and F. She said they are excited to have Youth Care in the neighborhood and their opposition to nomination was a surprise. She said

adaptive reuse will be beneficial to both the building and to Youth care. She said that Nellie Cornish lived here.

Karen Jenns did not support nomination and said the building did not meet the standards for designation. She said the building has no integrity and can't convey its significance. She said it is barely recognizable.

Mike Malone supported nomination and said as a potential buyer of the building, it is an easy restoration. He noted the importance of arts education at this site and to the community.

Tagal Cooper, Youth Care did not support nomination and said the building had little historic character. Nellie Cornish established a building associated with her legacy. She was only at the Booth Building a short time.

Aliss Alcontrara did not support nomination and said there have been significant alterations over time. The building has no integrity. She said there are seventeen letters opposing nomination.

Beau August said the building has been altered so many times; the first floor has been completely changed.

Ken Robertson, Capitol Hill resident appreciated the thorough presentation and said he doesn't see the building as historic. It is very altered. There is a better legacy for Nellie Cornish at her campus.

Liz Dunn said she had served on the Capitol Hill Housing board and the Pike Pine Overlay committee. She said every building was considered. She said it is a distinctive building in location and form. She said it is an arts and culture building.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said she did research on the building and said it is not a slam dunk but says she now has more relevant information. She noted the Singerman Residence (Gaslight Inn), a Seattle landmark, was designed by Thompson and Thompson, the same architects as the subject property. She said she supported nomination and designation. She said it is not about the best, first, or oldest; it can convey its significance. She said for older mixed-use buildings, the storefronts are bound to change over time.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, said he submitted written comments affirming the significance of the Booth Building and citing the criteria for designation. He said he also forwarded a link to their submission of the Booth Building and Nellie Cornish to the National Trust's program "1,000 Places Where Women Left Their Mark." He said the submission was accepted, acknowledging Cornish's contribution and is live on the Trust's web site: <https://savingplaces.org/where-women-made-history#.Xkb12kBFyUI>

He said he wanted to respond to some comments suggesting that preservation, the work of Historic Seattle, gets in the way of the good work being accomplished by our friends in other non-profits. In fact, the reason for our work is that old buildings can provide an authentic connection to our shared histories living in Seattle. He said that Tom Mayes of the National Trust has written extensively on why a human sense of place is important. He recently published a book of essays entitled, "Why Old Places Matter: how Historic Places Affect our Identity and Well Being." He said Mayes describes how forming bonds with places is a prerequisite of psychological health and adjustment. He said that preservation of the booth Building offers an opportunity for future users to feel connected to the history of a remarkable Seattleite, Nellie Cornish, and to experience an authentic connection to her craft, culture and memories of place embodied in this historic building.

Stephanie Hsie, Weinstein AU, said their project started last May and has been put on hold pending studies. She said the organizations care about doing what is right for the community. She said they are looking at what the building is and what it can be.

Kathryn Hildenbrand, Capitol Hill resident, conservation overlay said art is in the water on Capitol Hill. She asked how parties involved can get together and have a great design. She said the tower is there; the building is a landmark.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Wasserman supported nomination of the exterior and said it conveys significance. She said the storefronts are icky and there is nothing redeemable inside.

Mr. Macleod supported nomination of exterior only. He said the storefronts are awful, but he noted the overall strong rhythm of windows and the tower and said the building retains integrity. He said it is less about Nellie but the building is the original center of arts for Capitol Hill and Capitol Hill culture. He said the music studios predated her and continued after. He wanted to hear more about the music studios.

Mr. Chalana supported nomination. He said the building retains its historic form, fenestration patterns, rhythm and distinct architecture. He said the tower is there and the building has integrity; mostly it has a bad paint job. He said it is important for women's history, institutional history. He wants to hear more about that and how did it evolve and impact institutions in general. He wanted more information on Nellie Cornish and high-resolution images.

Ms. Chang did not support nomination and said it has not been significant as a music building for a long time. She said she may reconsider at designation

with more information. She said the storefronts have lost much of their original character. She said the northeast entry is not recognizable.

Mr. Coney said the board doesn't deal with use or future projects. He said the board just looks at the building, its history and if it has integrity. He said the loss of the parapet at corners is not enough to lose the Mission Revival character. He noted other buildings – the Broadway and Denny buildings and the Ben Franklin Savings Bank – that have some alterations but could be historic in their own right. He said storefronts are fluid and do change. He said he wanted more information on Nellie Cornish and other groups that occupied the building, especially early on. He supported nomination of the exterior and noted the building is prominent on the corner in Capitol Hill.

Ms. Barker said loss of some of the parapet did not destroy the character. She said a whole lot more could be done to destroy integrity. She said Nellie Cornish had hutzpah – she started a business, rented rooms, and lived there. She started Cornish there. She said the building retains integrity and Cornish would today know which window was hers. She said she loved the towers with overhanging roofs. She supported nomination.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Booth Building, located at 1534 Broadway Avenue for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the building exterior; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 1, 2020; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MC/HW 5:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Chang opposed.

021920.3 CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

021920.31 Magnolia Elementary School
2418 28th Avenue West
Proposed building addition; Phase 2

Ms. Doherty noted the board approved an earlier addition; this expansion of the south wing was discussed in general at that time.

David Mount, Mahlum Architects, said the west and north are primary façades and will be preserved as is. He said the south addition will house a library and six classrooms and will be nicely knitted in. He said their approach is to respect the public façade. They will evolve the language if the playground area to more modern and transparent. He stated the intent is to create 21st Century learning spaces while preserving character. He said the top of the hill

play area will be maintained. The addition will carry forth the same language as other additions; the palette will match that of Phase I with brick compatible with the original brick and new fiber cement panel cladding. Inside, change in color of tackable wall surface is proposed. He went over interior and exterior finish palettes. He said wood floors in classrooms are being restored.

Mr. Chalana asked how much square footage was being added.

Mr. Mount said 8,000sf is being added in this phase; 25,000 sf was added in Phase I.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Wasserman said it looks nice and the materials look compatible. She noted there is no impact to historic fabric, and this is a reasonable way to add classrooms.

Mr. Coney said what is proposed doesn't touch historic material and there is a notch left to add light in. He said it is a nice proposal and he supported it.

Mr. Chalana said the new addition is bulkier than Phase I, but ARC thought it was OK.

Ms. Barker said it is on the back of the school building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for changes to the site, building interior, and proposed building addition at Magnolia Elementary School, 2418 28th Avenue West, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 435/15), as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, 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/IM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

021920.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

021920.41 The Showbox
1426 First Avenue

Request for extension

Jack McCullough presented on behalf of the owner, 1426 First LLC. He passed out financial review documents. He said the structure was designated and owner expects a reasonable economic return. It is the burden of the owner to look at alternatives to find an economic return; they have done that. He said they spent several months looking at alternatives. He requested an extension to allow board members time to review the packet of information he brought. He said Mr. Kiel had asked them to identify an alternative to allow vertical development above the existing building that did not involve modifying the building. He said they are unable to do that as the construction of foundation would destroy the building. He explained the result of their exploration was not favorable, and the conclusion is they are unable to find redevelopment alternative that will develop a reasonable economic return. He said they tried to identify key elements to save and reinstall in a new structure. He said they included that in the model. They were unable to find a development alternative that would save the building and generate a reasonable economic return. He suggested meeting again in mid-April to May.

Ms. Sodt said she received the distributed packet this morning and that she needs time to review it.

Mr. Coney asked how they are dealing with the existing tunnel under the building.

Mr. McCullough said they can't put load on the tunnel. They would have to drill giant caissons on either side of tunnel and install a transfer slab on top; it is very challenging to do even without an existing building there.

Mr. Coney asked if they had considered offers made to purchase the building.

Mr. McCullough said the three offers are low.

Ms. Barker noted discussions about component features being removed and reinstalled as amenity for building occupants and not operated as a public venue.

Mr. McCullough concurred.

Ms. Sodt said they do look at the value of the building with Controls.

Mr. McCullough said they would have to take the entire structure down. They could remove and store identified features first.

Public Comment:

Sara Patton, Friends of the Market said they sent a letter dated January 31, 2020. She said they want strict Controls and Incentives and full protection for the building and its features per the SMC. She said there is an offer on the table and no need to redevelop. She said that Pike Place Market was planned to be 'urbanly renewed' and torn down to build a tall parking structure and put stalls on top; that was stopped. She said this sounds like the same thing.

Brian Layton, STG said in October 2019 they made an offer on the building and have heard no response. He asked for Controls like what is on the Paramount, the Moore Theater and the Neptune. He said they have experience with landmarked buildings. He said the Showbox should continue to be a cultural asset to the city.

Shannon Well said Friends of the Showbox is a grassroots community group that has gotten 100,000 signers on its petition. She said they made valentines for the Showbox. She said to remember the people and the community who want to save this place. She said there is a reasonable offer on the table.

Naomi West, Historic Seattle said the community is involved and cares for the Showbox. She said she is speaking for their constituency. She said she feels the process is being exploited with requests for extension. She said the surprise presentation of the document is not in the nature of a public process. She said the owner should be held to a firm date to Controls and no more time or tricks should be allowed.

Jane Davies, Historic Seattle said they had only a couple hours to review the document. She said the land value is 41.4 million which is not substantiated by appraisal only by purchase and sale. She said that doesn't constitute a value of land. She said the calculations were based on numbers not accepted as valuation of property market value test. It talks about potential; the Ordinance doesn't say that.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle said they received the document a few hours ago. She said there is a lot of information and there are fatal flaws in the document to which they will respond. She said public comment from them in the future will address the Ordinance, how they view it and interpret it and how they can show reasonable economic use. She said it doesn't mean reasonable economic use for private developer – that is not what it says. It says, 'maximum return on the investment'. It doesn't say 'highest and best use'. She said as a non-profit they have different expectations and know how to make it work. She said STG has shown how to successfully run entertainment venues. She said they own eight properties and operate in the black. She said it is possible to do this with Controls. She said the case law says and what is used in the financial package was incorrect.

Mr. Coney asked if they had time to review the document.

Ms. Woo said the process includes the City, City Attorney office, board and subcommittee of the board. She said they will need time to review and ask questions back and forth.

Ms. Sodt asked if Mr. Coney asked the question in a general sense.

Mr. Coney said they can't force Controls and Incentives because it goes to Council and they are the ultimate ratifier. Typically, if it is not agreed to with owner it won't fly.

Ms. Barker asked why this goes to ARC first to discuss.

Ms. Sodt said they have talked in the past and had ARC look at the development alternatives explored. She said she received information the first time in late December which they did disclose to everyone. She said she was waiting for this submittal which was received today. She said she has been asking Mr. McCullough when she would receive the information and she said she has been conveying that information to Ms. Woo at Historic Seattle. She said now they can talk about how to proceed in reviewing the materials.

Mr. McCullough said they are anticipating setting a date.

Ms. Barker asked if ARC would review and discuss first.

Ms. Wasserman said review at ARC might be a good place to start.

Mr. Chalana said he was glad the owner's representative understands the intent of the extension. He asked what the intent of the extension request is if all alternatives were explored.

Mr. McCullough said the board has the opportunity to review the document and ask questions and to move in a logical way.

Ms. Sodt said time is needed to review the financial document.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Showbox 1426 1st Avenue until May 20, 2020.

MM/SC/RC/___ *There was no second to the motion.*

Ms. Barker suggested ARC review in the interim.

Mr. Chalana asked how to keep this from going on.

Ms. Doherty said it is very unusual for the owner representative to hand out a financial packet to the Board at a meeting for a C&I extension request. Usually it is given to staff and then shared with members of the Board. She said that will still be done. She said perhaps there will be an opportunity to brief the ARC on the feasibility of the design development options, not the figures. She said a three-month extension is common and reasonable. She said staff will review the document and prepare a letter with clarifying questions for the owner to respond to. She said it is an iterative process to determine if there is enough information to make an informed decision.

Ms. Sodt said the Code gives the criteria. She said staff relies on the property owner to provide relevant information. She said she has been waiting for the property owner to provide this information. As of today there is a document to review and prepare questions.

Ms. Wasserman supported the extension until May 20, 2020 as long as board can ask questions in the interim.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Showbox 1426 1st Avenue until May 20, 2020.

MM/SC/RC/IM 6:0:0 Motion carried.

021920.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator