



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649  
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 542/15

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, September 2, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Nick Carter

Robert Ketcherside

Aaron Luoma

Matthew Sneddon

Mike Stanley

Elaine Wine

#### Staff

Sarah Sordt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Deb Barker

Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair

Alison Walker Brems, Chair

Elaine Wine, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

#### **090215.1**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

July 1, 2015

MM/SC/RK/MSN

4:0:2 Minutes approved. Messrs. Carter and Sneddon abstained.

July 15, 2015

MM/SC/RK/MSN

5:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Carter abstained.

August 5, 2015

MM/SC/RK/AL

3:0:3 Minutes approved. Messrs. Sneddon, and Stanley, and Ms. Wine abstained.

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

**090215.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

090215.21 University Library  
5009 Roosevelt Way NE  
Proposed building exterior and site alterations, and interior seismic improvements

Erin Anderson, SHKS Architects, explained proposed alterations, repair, and selective seismic improvements. She said that work related to entry, storm water, and interior seismic were being reviewed administratively but were presented for overall context of work. She said that the west entry is not original historic fabric; they will make it ADA compliant. She said they will replace the door and transom with full light aluminum door. She said all plantings, and south sidewalk will be replaced in-kind. She said guardrails will be replaced with the same material. She said that decorative guardrails flanking the entry will be removed. She said at the main entry they will remove the handrails. Brick and concrete will replace concrete stairs; stairs will be shifted one tread westward to get the required handrail extensions within the property line. She said the north door is non-compliant; they will refinish it and modify the interior hardware.

Mr. Stanley asked if the entry stair handrail is there now.

Ms. Anderson said it is.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if the front post will be in line with the current one.

Ms. Anderson said it will be.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about the rear door replacement.

Ms. Anderson said that they will change it out because there is not adequate clear width for ADA compliance.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said that the work won't detract from the building.

Mr. Sneddon said that the work was carefully considered to avoid impacting the historic fabric.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior building and site alterations at the University Library, 5009 Roosevelt Way NE, as submitted.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior building and site alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121104 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/NC/RK            6:0:0    Motion carried.

090215.22

Bon Marche/Macy's

300 Pine Street

Proposed interior and exterior alterations

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill, said she represented Starwood. She said they are revisiting 2008 proposed changes to the building. She said that a penthouse and other interior alterations are proposed to accommodate a new upper floor office tenant. She said that interior seismic upgrades are proposed as well.

Brian Gowers, Callison, provided context of the site. He said seismic upgrades are planned to bring the building up to code. He explained the intent to re-tenant upper floors. He explained that on the first floor concrete shear walls 30" thick will be constructed; they will be located within stairwells where possible.

Ms. Clawson said the store will remain operational during the work.

Mr. Gowers explained that there will be a continuous shear wall on the east side with a small opening to allow display window access; the depth will be 2' to allow for display windows. He said that the shear wall above spans the entry on Pine Street.

He explained that express elevators will run from street level on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to level 8 to serve offices on 5 – 8. He said that on the west and north ends of the mezzanine level will be used for the office lobby. He said that three sets of doors will be replaced; existing are non-original and were installed in the 1970s. He said they will replace door leaves and hardware. He said that the taller door bottom will meet ADA and Code; finish will match the same anodized finish as frames with flat plate hardware.

Mr. Gowers said they will run tube steel above the ceiling space and will not disrupt the soffit system on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. He said they will cut into plaster ceiling to insert steel members. He said they will bolt to the existing concrete beams by steel plates and will stay out of ornate soffit. He said that if damage occurs the contractor knows how to fabricate. He said that levels 5 – 8 will have operable doors on the shaft. He said that a shuttle elevator will go from 5<sup>th</sup> floor to the roof. He said that the 6<sup>th</sup> floor connection to the skybridge to garage will remain; Macy's will have access to it.

He said that the mechanical rooms will be on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor. He said that there are no windows so propose to construct a 50' x 50' clerestory penthouse to let light in to the 8<sup>th</sup> floor; sections of the 8<sup>th</sup> floor will be cut out to allow light to the 7<sup>th</sup> floor. He said they plan a future roof deck. He said they will refurbish existing skylights with new glass and aluminum frames. He said they will add new skylights on the roof deck. He said that the elevator for the shuttle elevator will be on the upper roof. He said the roof stair on the north elevation will be reconstructed in the same location. He said that windows on the 7<sup>th</sup> floor level will be removed, restored and replaced;

glazing will be replaced with energy code glass. He said they propose vertical bands on the windows in the stairwells that are blocked by shear wall.

Mr. Gowers said that there are no shear walls on the west; some glass will change to mechanical louvers. He said that the elevator overrun will be similar in height to the existing penthouse. He said that window parts will be salvaged. He showed the proposed features in context and went through site lines study in materials packet.

Mr. Luoma asked if the shear wall will impede pedestrian entry way.

Mr. Gowers said that all entries will be fully open. He said that every level will have a drag strut.

Ms. Wine asked if there were other options for the patterned glass and said she wondered how that will read as opposed to more translucent backing.

Mr. Gower said the painted on patterns are cleaner and more consistent.

Ms. Wine asked about how close the proposed glazing matches existing.

Mr. Gowers said they have gotten as close a match as they can and still meet energy code.

Mr. Stanley noted the removal of the stairwell and asked about the design evolution process.

Mr. Gowers said there were very few options to put the office lobby.

Mr. Luoma asked if they had thought about just leaving the windows dark versus painting them.

Mr. Gowers said the unpainted glass is very dark.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Wine said the applicants had been to ARC multiple times where there was general support. She said that the changes to the roof are not overly impactful and are not visible from the street. She said that shear walls on the interior are reasonable and not perceived. She said that she is fine with alterations for office entry and was generally supportive that there will be move upper level floor usage. She said it is a creative way to do that.

Mr. Luoma said some ARC members were concerned with the scale and height of the penthouses but noted the overall scale of the building and minimal visibility. He said that most people don't realize how dark the building is and activating the building will light it up at night.

Mr. Sneddon said the scale of the penthouse matches existing structures on the building. He said that the window replacement will match existing design.

Mr. Carter said only the first floor is designated and he had no problem with the changes.

Ms. Wine noted concern with the color of glazing and said it is a noticeable difference.

Ms. Sodt reported that there is an energy code exemption for historic buildings especially since they are reusing existing sash.

Mr. Gowers said that new glazing will be on the 7<sup>th</sup> floor and eventually 5 and 6; he said it corresponds with where the change of limestone is.

Ms. Wine said the glazing should more closely match the windows in place.

Mr. Ketcherside said that ARC could review and approve the glazing.

Ms. Clawson said they are willing to do that.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior and interior alterations with condition that glazing color be reviewed and approved by ARC.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 114772 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/NC/RK          6:0:0    Motion carried.

**090215.3          NOMINATION**

090215.31          Wayne Apartments  
2224 2nd Avenue

Ms. Wine explained the meeting process for nomination and public comment.

David Peterson presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the building and site and noted the building's association with the regrade. He explained this was the rural part of the city at the time but after the great fire, WWI, and the regrade the city started to continue north. He said that Lewis and Miranda Rowe built the building between 1888 and 1893; in 1890 there were three addresses along the street one belonging to the Rowes and another to Seth Clark.

He said he thought there were three individual rowhouses that were then turned into multiple units; he noted the flexibility of the rowhouse. He said the rowhouse style

was popular on the east coast and has openings on the front and back with shared parti walls. He said that the city developed so quickly that many of the rowhouses were torn down. He explained that the front yard was adapted to commercial use at the ground floor. He said that during the regrade this building was lifted up, moved to adjacent lot, new commercial constructed and the building was placed on top. He said that there are not a lot of examples of this style here; the Victorian Row is the best comparable. It was built in 1891 it is the only pre-1900s in unaltered condition.

Mr. Peterson said that in 1911 the Rowes sold the building to Charles Schneider and his wife. He said that 1911 as-builts show the building as already cut up. Double chimneys were removed, kitchen added in front in addition to one in back. He said the walkway in the back is still there.

He said that in 1908 Charles Haynes was hired to design the three-unit commercial structure to the building. He said that other buildings designed by Haynes include the Broadway Market, Packard Auto Showroom, Donohoe Garage / Bergman Luggage, Royview Apartments, and the Dunlap Apartments. He worked on and supervised the Pacific Telephone Building which was remodeled to accommodate the regrade.

The subject building is a mixed-use structure, currently with one story of three commercial storefronts at sidewalk level, and seventeen apartments on the second and third floors. The upper level apartments were originally three two-story wood-frame attached rowhouses constructed sometime between 1888 and 1893. The upper levels of the building, which pre-date the Denny Hill regrade, represent a once-common but now extremely rare rowhouse building form in Seattle, although this example has been altered. In 1911, the rowhouses (by that time divided into numerous apartments) were raised and the one-story unreinforced masonry commercial structure was constructed underneath, presumably to improve the viability of the structure following the regrading of the Second Avenue portion of Denny Hill, which was completed around 1906. The subject building has been called a “regrade hybrid,” referring to “one and two story frame buildings from the late 19th century and early years of the 20th century that were raised so a retail first floor could be slipped underneath to meet the newly graded street,” which occurred in Seattle’s regraded neighborhoods (primarily Chinatown/ID, the Central Business District, Pike/Pine, and Belltown). The mixed-use nature of the building—ie, that it was originally a residential structure, with commercial space later built at sidewalk level—is less rare in Seattle, and found occasionally in older neighborhoods.

The west or main elevation of the building consists of a base of three commercial storefronts at the first floor, which meet the sidewalk at the property line. The commercial spaces are approximately equal width; however, the far right (southernmost) storefront is narrower than the other two, in order to accommodate an exterior stair against the south property line which accesses the residential units on the second and third floors. Original drawings, as well as the 1937 tax assessor photographs, show that each storefront at that time featured large areas of storefront glazing separated by brick pilasters, a recessed store entry, and a multi-light transom above. A simple, masonry projecting entablature element formed the parapet above the pilasters. Over time, the commercial storefronts have been altered to suit tenants; according to building permits, major updates to the storefronts occurred in 1957. Today, the west elevation features a textured and painted stucco finish, perhaps over

the original brick, and the projecting entablature portion of the parapet is no longer extant. Storefront bulkheads are now brick. Storefront windows are now aluminum sash, except for the center store, which replaced its storefront glazing with a solid wall and porthole windows probably in the 1980s. The recessed entries feature white hexagonal tiles with a Greek key pattern surround in gray square tiles, of unknown date. Only the far left storefront retains an apparently original wood sash transom; the others have been covered over or removed (the far right storefront's covered transom is visible from the interior). Beyond these features, each storefront has been customized with different exterior painting, signage, and awnings.

The commercial spaces today retain no significant interior features, although exposed brick is visible at some locations. First floor ceiling heights are 12 feet. One of the commercial spaces features a pressed-tin ceiling, but this appears to be a recent and non-historic installation. According to architectural drawings, these spaces originally were simply long, open, rectangular rooms separated by fire walls, with restrooms at the back, and access to the alley at the rear. The alley side exterior wall for the three commercial spaces features at least one punched-opening window per storefront. The alley-side door and window openings feature brick relieving arch at the headers.

Mr. Peterson explained that some of the storefront transoms are covered. He said that some upper level architectural details have been removed – the gables, the projecting entries are gone, upper level windows are original but in bad condition. He said that shingle patterns are intact. He said there is one remaining part of the roof with detail. He said that the asphalt brick pattern siding was applied in 1950s and he is not sure if it was installed over the original wood. He said the fifteen residential units are entered from the sidewalk; temporary framing is on the projecting porchlets.

He noted the intact trim on the interior and noted the walls are plaster with fir trim. He said there have been numerous alterations but it still has the feel of a series of rooms. He said the commercial spaces have all been altered. He said there have been many occupants over time. He said that the architectural detail is lost but he said it is a fascinating building. He said the association with the Rowes is not significant enough.

Ms. Wine asked if the building is one of the oldest structures in downtown.

Mr. Peterson said the Hull and Austin Bell buildings were built in 1889.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if he looked into Lewis Rowe's association with Burien Tradewell and his grocery stores.

Mr. Peterson said that he didn't. He said Rowe died in 1910.

Mr. Ketcherside noted Reuben McKnight's master's thesis mentions Rowe. He noted the Corliss Store and wondered if the business had been sold to Stone. He asked if there was a connection between Rowe's carriage and grocery businesses.

Mr. Peterson said that he didn't pursue that.

Mr. Ketcherside said that there are interesting moments in the building's first occupancy and owners and suggested that their connections be explored. He asked about this building's relationship to the regrade.

Mr. Peterson said it was right at the edge of Denny Hill. He said buildings were frequently left on hills with access via dirt paths and rickety stairs. He said that the plan was not perfectly symmetrical; two units repeat and the third is different.

Mr. Luoma said that the Hull and Austin Bell buildings predate the regrade. He asked if this building is the closest to the hill that still stands.

Mr. Peterson said yes, probably. He said there are examples of other buildings that were moved to other parts of town. Responding to questions he said that it was lifted up, moved to next door lot and then moved back. He said he believes that Rowe and Seth Clark lived here in 1890.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if there are assessor files at the archives.

Mr. Peterson said that he found nothing significant.

Mr. Ketcherside noted that the construction date was narrowed down to 1889 – 91 based on the assessor file.

Public Comment:

Ms. Wine said that a number of letters were received and had been forwarded to board (in DON file).

Neil Kuback supported nomination on Criterion B and said that Haynes was just starting out when hired for this job. He noted the growth of art and science and this building's part in that. He said it is a piece of Belltown.

Paul Kampelmeier said he represented the owner of Shorty's and submitted two letters (in DON file). He said they supported nomination of the unique and significant building which, he said, is very rare. He said that most if not all similar buildings have been demolished and this may be one of the only from that era. He noted the grunge scene was significant in the 1980s and is associated. He said they have had very little time to review and comment on the criteria; he said they have had just 24 hours to digest, review and analyze. He encouraged support of the nomination or a deferral.

Cami Funk supported nomination on Criterion C. She said the building has shaped the lives of everyone in the room and has created a culture that is unforgettable.

Steve Hall supported nomination and said the building meets criteria C and D. He said it meets Criterion A in its association with the regrade. He noted the rapid growth of the City – the population doubled – and its response to the major shift in population. He noted the continual use of the building as evidence of its integrity. He asked for deferral and noted they just found out about this yesterday and the community needs time to respond in a thoughtful way. He said this is not South Lake



Union and noted the history of funkiness; the architecture is an anchor that ties beginnings to future.

Alyson Rae supported nomination and said the building provides a special vintage quality and houses several small businesses. She asked for support of the artists and the subculture there.

Samuel Castro supported nomination and said it was on Anthony Bourdain.

James Todd said it is 'the real Seattle'. He noted the Wayne Apartments and its stories are the past and present of Belltown.

Evan Clifthorne, Staff to Councilmember Rasmussen, said CM Rasmussen noted the importance of the decision and asked for 30 – 60 days for those interested to get engaged and speak. He said that despite the press release most here just heard about the nomination.

Beck Priget noted the diversity the Wayne Apartments brought to the area and said the tenants were a mixture of social classes. She said the low rent lofts allows for financial and social diversity while significant development is going on. She said the businesses serve a variety of clientele. She said that the building is not architecturally untouched as other changes occurred. She said that the building survived the regrade, earthquakes, and social upheaval. She noted its chameleon-like ability to change with the times while remaining what it was built to be – a home.

Don Payne said he was a resident of the building for two years. He said in the Midwest they save old buildings and it is sad to see everything wiped out here.

Crystal Barbre supported nomination or deferral.

Jeremy Jacklin commented on the cultural significance of the building and said it is a living history in Belltown. He noted the homogenization of the city and said that there are still pockets of local culture.

Alex Skinner said the city has changed and spoke in support of nomination.

Chuck Little thanked Mr. Peterson for his research and thanked the board.

Jimmy Windsor said the community there is like the 1980s and said that it is a video game place. He said it is very important. He said that May 6, 2011 recognized video games as art. He said the building is historic and important. He supported nomination.

Sandra Call, Belltown Inn, supported nomination.

Madeline Woodward said it is historically important and said that for all these people this is their place; it is part of the fabric of the city.

Josh Art said they have worked to rebuild the block with thriving businesses. He said if this one goes the others will too. He said the whole block is important.

Nicholas Nikvan said that the report convinced him that this building is more significant than he realized. He noted the cultural significance in the 1980s and now. He said it is what put Seattle on the map. He said with time they will be able to better respond.

Derek Scott said they need more time. He spoke to the significance of the whole block and said it is a diverse area / neighborhood.

Chris Word said he just heard about the meeting. He said he learned a lot from the report. He said that if this block goes it will impact adjacent blocks.

Kelly Maheu said they just found out about this and they need more time.

Adam Asavei supported nomination.

Brent Boardman said that if this goes there is no more Belltown; this block defines Belltown.

Andrew Dell said he always brings people to Belltown. He said the building is organic.

Ronny Czpls said they need more time.

David Horvitz said that this is the only thing left that has the Seattle feel. He said it was short notice and asked for more time.

Brian Loftus commented on the adaptive use of the building and said it is important.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside commented on public notice and asked audience members to think about where they get their information from and ask those sources to cover preservation more. He said the chain of information broke on this one. He said he supported nomination but was concerned about integrity. He said he wants a direct look. He said that multiple criteria could be met. He said he hadn't thought of the regrade as an event before and wondered if it could meet A. He noted the cultural history and questioned if Rowe was significant – he asked for more information on him. He said that there are not many buildings that embody the Denny Regrade.

Mr. Stanley said it was delightful to hear from the public. He said the board must apply the criteria. He questioned the integrity but said it can convey its significance. He said he was interested in learning more about C and D and said period represented is important. He said that the building is one of the defining buildings of Belltown. He supported nomination.

Mr. Carter said he was impressed with the number of attendees given the short notice. He said that the building has integrity issues but that it could meet a lot of criteria. He said it could be one of the oldest buildings in Belltown and is a significant part of Seattle culture. He said he wanted more information on Rower and on the Denny Regrade association. He supported nomination.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination but noted integrity issues. He said the designation standard provides for integrity or the ability to convey significance; he said it can convey significance. He noted the connection to the regrade and said it narrowly missed that event and potentially could have been torn down. He said the building has adapted to mixed use and retail. He said that it looks jumbled and is falling apart and questioned if it has enough of a story and the ability to convey its association to the regrade. He said it may be the closest building to the major regrade that still stands. He said he appreciated the public support and the connection to the recent past. He said the critical connection is the regrade and said there are very few distinct buildings with that connection.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination on C, D and F. He noted the regrade as an event. He said the building reflects the historical trends – the post fire building to the crash. He noted transitions from being part of the building trades to 1911 when professional architects come into the fore. He noted the transition from frontier speculators – the Rows and Schneiders – to 1920 with more investment dollars come from the east coast. He said that it fits into the Denny Regrade association and noted the remote residential area turned into a commercial district. He said that the building represents the Queen Anne Style with its gables and pitched roofs and the use of walls as decorative elements; brackets or bracket work. He said that rowhouse examples are almost cookie cutter and this is a great example of a lost style. He said that some features are gone but noted that decorative elements are easily restored. He said that the type allows latitude in terms of changes and how architectural trends play out. He supported C, D and F and said it is very recognized in the neighborhood.

Ms. Wine supported nomination. She said that apartment has the most integrity and the storefronts have been altered. She said that the building upstairs can convey its significance overrides any lack of integrity. She said the loss of detail is not big enough and you can still understand the typology. She said that it is one of the first buildings in Seattle in that neighborhood is important. She said it is a rare building. She questioned how a building can convey its culture and significance if it has lost integrity and how this building helps to define the block as a whole. She noted the amazing support from the community and said that this is the most public speakers we have had. She said that nominating the building as opposed to deferring consideration should allow adequate time for the public to come back on October 7 for the designation meeting.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of Wayne Apartments at 2224 Second 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 exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for October 7, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RK/NC 6:0:0 Motion carried.

**090215.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

090215.41 Daniel Bagley Elementary School  
7821 Stone Avenue North

Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a 12 month extension; she read a letter from the School District. She indicated that the School district is planning to renovate the school and build an addition. They are just in preliminary planning stages.

Mr. Sneddon asked if ARC would review any work in the interim.

Ms. Doherty said that the processes can work in parallel. She said they will need a Certificate of Approval for all proposed alterations within the areas of control, until a Controls and Incentives Agreement is signed.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Daniel Bagley Elementary School, 7821 Stone Way North, for twelve months.

MM/SC/NC/AL 6:0:0 Motion carried.

090215.42 Daniel Webster Elementary School  
3014 NW 67<sup>th</sup> Street  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for an 18-month extension to allow time to obtain funding for renovations; she read a letter from the School District. She said they plan to renovate the building for use a neighborhood school.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Daniel Webster Elementary School, 3014 NW 67<sup>th</sup> Street, for eighteen months.

MM/SC/RK/NC 6:0:0 Motion carried.

**090215.5 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator