



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 302/16

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday, May 18, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Nick Carter  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel  
Kristen Johnson  
Aaron Luoma, Chair  
Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon  
Mike Stanley

### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Marjorie Anderson  
Jeffrey Murdock  
Kathleen Durham

Chair Aaron Luoma called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**051816.1**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

March 16, 2016

MM/SC/MST/KJ

7:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Carter abstained.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

**051816.2            CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

051816.21            Volunteer Park  
1400 East Prospect Street

Ms. Doherty explained the signed Controls & Incentives agreement; she read through the agreement.

Ms. Barker asked for clarification on landmarked areas.

Ms. Doherty said the whole park is designated, and noted that the Art Museum and the Conservatory are individual landmarks.

Mr. Ketcherside asked why the artwork was excluded.

Ms. Doherty said that they do not include artwork because it can be confusing related to ownership and that there may be artist agreements. The city and museum want the flexibility to move the art. She cited the example of the Calder piece being relocated to the Sculpture Park.

Mr. Luoma asked about administrative approval related to emergencies.

Ms. Doherty noted it is carefully crafted language that lets the Landmarks staff know what is happening, but allows SPU and Parks to act immediately with regard to safety issues at the water tower and reservoir.

Eliza Davidson, Seattle Friends of Olmsted Parks, said they are separate landmarks; that proposed alterations to the museum will come to the board for modifications some of which may exceed footprint and enter park space.

Ms. Doherty said that the park designation captures all of the land around the museum. The museum currently does not have a signed Controls and Incentives agreement but it is being worked on. She noted that a portion of the park is controlled as part of the museum (there is overlap), and it is related to the landscape delineated in the Hoggson Plan (west of the museum).

Kathleen Conner, DOPAR, said they are happy with the result of the agreement– it allows for work and rehabilitation. She thanked the Seattle Friends of Olmsted Parks for the nomination. She said they hope to bring the park back to more closely reflect the original Olmsted planting design.

Action: I move to approve the Controls & Incentives for Volunteer Park, 1400 East Prospect Street.

MM/SC/DB/NC            8:0:0    Motion carried.

051816.22            Loyal Heights Elementary School  
2501 NW 80<sup>th</sup> Street  
Request for an extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for six month extension. She said they will have a major rehabilitation and addition and are working on it; they have briefed ARC three or four times.

Mr. Luoma said they are getting there, and a six month extension is reasonable.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Loyal Heights Elementary School, 2501 NW 80<sup>th</sup> Street for six months.

MM/SC/NC/JP 8:0:0 Motion carried.

051816.23 Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse  
2815 Elliott Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the request for four month extension. She said they have briefed ARC and have another one schedule soon. She said she was OK with the extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Aisworth & Dunn Warehouse, 2815 Elliott Avenue, for four months.

MM/SC/NC/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

051816.24 Wayne Apartments  
2224 2nd Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a two month extension. She said Messrs. Stanley, Kiel, and Murdock are reviewing feasibility documents. She said she was OK with the extension.

Ms. Barker asked if they had anything ready for ARC yet.

Ms. Sodt said they do not.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Wayne Apartments, 2224 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, for two months.

MM/SC/NC/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

**051816.3 DESIGNATION**

Mr. Luoma explained the designation presentation process.

051816.31 Guild 45<sup>th</sup> Theatre  
2115 North 45<sup>th</sup> Street

Chris Hetzel, ICF International, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and building and an overview of the history of the building. He said it was originally two buildings: original two-story theater was constructed in 1920 and the one-story commercial building was

constructed in 1921. He said that there have been five substantial rehabilitations: 1923, 1933, 1949, 1957, and one in 1978-79 which is what is seen today. He said the building lacks integrity from the period of significance.

He provided overview of ownership and the renovations over time from the first addition in 1923; removal of Mediterranean Style and addition of Art Deco elements in the 1930s; removal of canopy, installation of marquee, addition of veneer, multiple moves of entry and ticketing in 1940s, merge with commercial space next store; to the interior and exterior conditions that exist today. He said that nearly all the character defining features were removed from interior and there is no integrity from any period from before 1977; the Streamlined Deco done then is not high quality.

He said that there was a revival of Art Deco Style in the 1970s and 1980s but it was not a wide trend. He said that 26 historic theaters still exist in Seattle from the silent film era; nearly all are closed or substantially altered. He said the Moore, Neptune, 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Taproot, Paramount among others are still intact. He said he didn't find anything else that had been renovated like this one. He said that the marquee was original slightly off center; a new sign was put up in 1933 – 'Bruen's 45'; in 1949 the sign was relocated to the center and 'Bruen's' was removed. He noted that the sign box was rebuilt / replaced at this time and the sign had an asymmetrical shape. He provided comparison photos of the sign in 1957 and 1996 when the existing signs were installed.

Michael Fant, Landmark Theaters, said that they are the largest distributor of art and independent films. He said they have renovated historic theaters around the country and said they couldn't find anything to preserve here. He said the front of the building has lost its architectural flavor – it has been re-done so many times it is blunt and boring and there is nothing of consequence. He said they want to build a new theater. He said most of the public comments were concerned with the theatre use, and that will continue.

Ms. Barker asked about the type and size of the remodels they have done.

Mr. Fant said they vary in size; one of the larger theaters they renovated held 1300 seats and they converted it to three screens. He said the Crest Theater is one of their theaters.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the period of significance.

Mr. Hetzel said if you set aside integrity there are multiple periods based on ownership at the time, but there is nothing physical left to convey any of that. He said the changes have been so drastic. He noted the continuous use as a theater from 1920 until now.

Public Comment:

Laura Kauffman, Seattle Cinema Club, spoke in support of designation and said it met criteria C and F. She noted the neon sign and said it is the oldest continuing

operating cinema in Seattle; the only other is the Neptune. She noted the 1949 blade sign, original neon, and projection room.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma asked what was nominated.

Ms. Doherty said the Board nominated the site, exterior and interior.

Ms. Barker did not support designation – it did not meet criteria A, B, D, E. or F although perhaps C because of its use. She said the tour was interesting and she enjoyed the projection room which has been adapted over time. She noted the deferred maintenance and said the building didn't tell its story anymore. She said it has been adapted over time and the whole interior has been changed over the years.

Mr. Carter did not support designation – it did not meet criteria A, B, D or E. He said that the building did not meet Criterion F - the sign does but it has been modified. Regarding Criterion C he said that it has always been a theater but that it lacks integrity from the period of significance which is more the 1920s-40s and maybe the 1950s but not the 1970s onward.

Mr. Sneddon noted criteria C and F and said the building does represent the history of small theaters in Seattle 1920 – 1970s. He said it can convey what it is through location, size, scale, and neighborhood type. He said it is important in the way movies were distributed and seen in neighborhood style; it is a distinctive part of the movie business and to the development of Wallingford. He said film as well as live performances occurred there and he noted the building's continuous use as a theater. He said the projection room remains. He said that the current architecture was constructed in 1978 and is over 25 years old; he said it is significant and reflects the nature of the theater business. He said the architecture is the selling point for the theater and those deliberate changes appealed to the public. He said it is significant in that it coincides with the rise of the urban multiplex that took movies out of the neighborhood and into malls. He supported designation of the exterior.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support designation. He said he appreciated the report and the public comment. He said it is not a clear issue. He said the building has operated from the silent era to the mall and multiplex era but that it has no integrity from the early era. He agreed with the Staff Report. He said that the building provided economic and cultural value and is tied up in Criterion C; it was part of the development of the economy and the City. He said it doesn't meet Criterion C with the current architectural integrity.

Ms. Patterson did not support designation and noted she has been there many times. She said she understood the public comment. She said the significance is tied to use, and not necessarily theater or architecture, or a specific tie to the neighborhood. She said the addendum was helpful and this is likely the oldest

theater in Seattle; she noted the Neptune was built in 1920. She said the continued use as a theater cannot be guaranteed.

Ms. Johnson did not support designation and said what is significant is its use over time and that isn't landmarked. She said the visible architecture is from the 1970s and that is a superficial application of the style. She appreciated the public comment that it is important to Wallingford but said it was not significantly so.

Mr. Stanley did not support designation and said the building had no integrity. He said he hoped the owner will understand the importance of the theater and its sign to the neighborhood.

Mr. Luoma did not support designation; he said the building had no integrity. He said the Board cannot preserve the use of the movie theatre. He said he didn't doubt the powerful cultural stories and the value to the community but that he didn't see that expressed and translated in physical form. He said one could argue that it represents a 1970s theater but that does a disservice to the 50 years prior that has been lost. He noted the public comments and said there weren't many remarks about the architectural features only about the experience of going to the movies and seeing the marquee. He said this would designate a false sense of historicism and there may be better ways of preserving the powerful story.

Ms. Barker said that the Admiral Theater is Streamline Moderne and is still there – it is the real thing.

Mr. Sneddon questioned how 'use' is separate from cultural heritage / history.

Ms. Doherty said the building may have cultural significance for its continued use as a movie theater, but clarified that the Board does not have purview of "use" and cannot require that it continue to operate as a movie theater.

Ms. Patterson said that if that is the most important part, then there is no guarantee it can be preserved as an intact representation of use.

Ms. Johnson said that what is there doesn't reflect the use since 1920, only the marquee does.

Ms. Barker noted the marquee at Broadway Market that has no relation to its previous use.

Mr. Sneddon said it has to convey the use. He said 1978 is an important part of the story – the size, scale, and location convey 1921, but it is hard to see. He said most buildings don't physically convey a lot of their story.

Mr. Ketcherside said the Neptune is more intact.

Mr. Luoma said that if they were to piece it together the possibilities are there, but it is not enough.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Guild 45<sup>th</sup> Theatre at 2115 North 45<sup>th</sup> Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the site and exterior.

MM/SC/MSN/NC 2:6:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Stanley, Ketcherside, Luoma and Mmes. Johnson, Patterson, and Barker opposed.

**051816.4 BRIEFINGS**

051816.41

Maritime Building

911 Western Avenue

Briefing on proposed addition massing options

Jack McCullough, attorney for Beacon Capital, said they would like input on massing and noted they had a positive meeting with ARC.

*Mr. Kiel arrived at 4:55 pm.*

Andy Wattula explained that the building is in terrible condition and is in need of seismic, fire, life-safety, ADA, roof, electrical, mechanical systems, plumbing, elevator repair / upgrade. He noted there are also sidewalk issues. He said they love the heavy timber columns and beams and want to preserve those. He said they want to add to the building to make it economically viable.

Ev Ruffcorn, NBBJ, explained that other concepts had been presented to ARC but were supportive of a wider, horizontal building with more development on east and at ground level. He said the lower mass is in scale with the waterfront context and the design is in response to new vision for waterfront. He said they believe the addition – a light structure of glass and metal – will contrast with the weight and solidity of the existing building. He provided multiple views of the building. He explained they are pulling up window proportions from existing building and responding to the exuberance of the building and the John Deere sign. He said they propose opaque walls to meet energy code and the vertical proportion will be pulled up from the existing building.

Streetscape / Level

Mr. Ruffcorn said they will change the front door and main lobby to Alaskan Way. He said the raised loading dock on west will serve as front door. He said they will add new street trees and landscaping, replace sidewalks to level with the building and transition to curb. He said that Western will be a pedestrian active street with trees in tree grates and they will re-use existing storefronts but they will be painted consistent with rest of building. He said they would strip the 1990s tile and restore original concrete frame. On the west side the loading dock will become entrance; there is 16' of frontage and they will expand the 8' dock to a full 16' for retail and dining. He said they will retain the utilitarian expression.

## Windows

Mr. Ruffcorn said 67% of the windows in the building have been replaced with a variety of type; he noted integrity and lead issues. He said that they have an information window survey of existing conditions. He said on the east most of the windows are original. He went over window precedents and said other building have more detail than the Maritime and the detail is in the windows; ARC suggested us of multi-pane windows and they are moving ahead with that.

Mr. McCullough said that view corridors run down the hill. He said that it is not departable and there is a seldom used Code section for which they are seeking endorsement.

Mr. Sneddon asked what they meant by 'exuberance at the corner' in design intent.

Mr. Ruffcorn said the angle would create deep shadow line to reinforce the scale giving the idea to give a sense that the wall is not as large. He said the end bay will not extend beyond the face of the building. The walls of the building will set back 3 – 3 ½' from the face of the original building; the bay comes out to the face.

Mr. Wattula said that ARC liked the precedent images from Vienna.

Ms. Barker asked if two of the three stories are skewed. She said if less traditional flavor it sends it to a different realm. She gave a thumbs up on the windows.

### Public Comment:

Heidi Hughes, Friends of Waterfront Seattle, spoke of the introduction of a Waterfront District and said that Beacon's work supports that vision. She said they are curating street level retail and Beacon embraces that. She said this is a catalytic project.

### Board Feedback:

Mr. Sneddon said the massing is reasonable; it doesn't over shadow the scale and volume of the original building. He said it preserves the horizontality and he supported the fenestration.

Mr. Sneddon noted they had gone from four new stories to three.

Mr. Luoma said the existing building has strong horizontality. The initial design was more vertical and disrupted that scale and proportion. He said that three floors and top maintained the same proportion. He said the new is lighter.

Mr. Carter said it looks good. The taller messed with the horizontal nature of the original building. He asked if the seldom used rule was invoked would become a precedent issue.

Ms. Sodt said it is exactly why it was written.



Ms. Barker said with the tighter form the existing building is within the view corridor – it is a big building. She said if the addition was even more skewed or more disorganized that still would be in the view corridor that says yes you can do things here that don't have to be all solids.

Mr. Ketcherside said he appreciated their response to ARC comments. He said that the windows are holding the form of the original building. He said that the building really make the building a period building. He said that doing something really interesting with the addition is necessary to offset it from the simplicity of the original building. If it was a really simple box trying to stay out of the way of the landmark it would get in the way of the landmark. He appreciated them applying real design to the concept. He said he really liked the direction.

Ms. Patterson said it looks great; with regard to massing she echoed Mr. Ketcherside's comments. She said the new is almost 'top-hat-ish'.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the energy code issue.

Mr. Ruffcorn said the maximum allowable vision glass they can have is 40% of the wall; they have to balance that on the other three sides.

Mr. Stanley said they could do it in spandrel glass.

Mr. Kiel said there are a whole bunch of options and he would like to see a broad range of them.

Mr. Luoma said Mr. Murdock's comment at ARC that the first floor of the addition was successful by its 'skewedness' and created a deeper shadow line so you immediately notice the scale of the landmark building.

Mr. McCullough said he hears there is support from the code point of view.

Ms. Sodt said that it is on a case by case basis and in this case there is support.

Mr. Wattula said they will bring in window survey.

051816.42

SR520 / Montlake Lid

Consultation with WSDOT on conceptual design

Ms. Johnson disclosed that her husband is a partner at LMN Architects and they are working on the project.

Ms. Sodt clarified that there will be no formal action taken by the Board.

Mr. Luoma disclosed that his office often works as a consultant for WSDOT.

Mr. Sneddon noted that he is a neighborhood resident.

Steve Archer, WSDOT Cultural Officer, said this is an unusual situation in that there is no formal designation, but that Karen Gordon has been representing the City of Seattle in Section 106 process. He said that WSDOT is seeking the Landmark

Board's guidance and input on the new SR520 lid that will be in the middle of the Montlake District, listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Kerry Philstrom, WSDOT, said the 520 west approach will be rebuilt with the lid, and the Portage Bay Bridge will be rebuilt later as part of the "Rest of the West Project Overview" (PowerPoint in DON file). She said this is a design-build project; RFPs will go out next year and construction will begin as early as 2018. She provided corridor design history 1997 – 2014. She said that Section 106 commitments include landscape design plan for the lid that is compatible with the historic character of the surrounding context.

Brianna Holan (w/ LMN), Urban Design Team, provided historic overview of Montlake and the Arboretum. She noted the Olmsted Principles, urban trail head, opportunity for neighborhood open space, land bridge, neighborhood interfaces, wayfinding, and interpretive elements and said they are working on how to knit it all together.

Ms. Sodt asked if there are Chief Seattle light bases on Montlake.

Lyle Bicknell said they are interested in board opinion of appropriate lighting as related to scale.

Ms. Sodt said to make sure they can accomplish what they are showing.

Ms. Barker left at 6:00 pm.

Presenters went over Olmsted principles and noted element to enhance user experience – benches, trails, lawn mounds, and a pavilion.

Mr. Ketcherside said when the boulevard system was built from 1905-14, until the Montlake Cut was created, it was a portage system with bike routes.

Mr. Archer said they are currently preparing a National Register multiple property nomination, and they are working closely with Friends of Olmsted parks. He said they are being mindful of representing the boulevard system.

Mr. Ketcherside said it is important and noted the return to use for bicyclists and the ability to have a pleasant ride through that area – as that was the original intention.

Mr. Luoma asked who they envision taking ownership.

Ms. Holan said that different user groups have been identified.

Mr. Sneddon noted an impromptu soccer game on a lid where the ball ended up in traffic.

Mr. Carter said they need to assume that people will absolutely be playing soccer there and to keep that in mind.

Mr. Stanley said he appreciated the nod to the importance of Montlake. He asked what elements of historic boulevards are being injected. He said this used to be a comfortable street before it was over-run.

Ms. Holan said they will add plantings and street trees to Montlake Boulevard.

Mr. Sneddon said that 1910-40 this was greenspace and asked what it looked like.

Mr. Bicknell said it was vestige of clearcut – fallow land. He said the neighborhood developed in the teens to 1920s.

Public Comment:

Mario Bianchi, resident, said he didn't see how the space will be used as planned. He said his neighborhood has old cool light poles; one got knocked down by WSDOT and was not replaced. He said he is afraid it won't get replaced. He said the lid is functional for traffic, but not for neighbors.

Mr. Kiel said that the greenspace will be the size of a city block. He said lots of surface transportation will be transferred to the lid. He said it should have the feel of residential space; more green and less ramp. He asked if there is any way to get more of a small connector at the east end. He said to create a stronger more meaningful connection. He said the pavilion is so close to Montlake Boulevard it will not be a great place to host an event. He asked if the lid could be bigger and longer.

Ms. Philstrom said they started there but that it required major ventilation shafts; big, tall stuff. She said the transportation exchange that added this lid is a reality. They are achieving a reconnection of the neighborhoods. She said the land bridge doesn't create a conflict with cars.

Mr. Kiel asked if they looked at filling in the hole between the land bridge and lid.

Ms. Philstrom said that it is a fire-life-safety issue. She said that ventilation shafts and fans would be required. She said their proposal is a better solution because of all the structure that is required to provide the tunnel option.

Mr. Sneddon asked if they considered moving the lid to the left or right.

Mr. Luoma said they are 'knitting communities back together' and will accomplish this through pedestrian, vehicle and open space. He said they have been divided for decades, and the edges are important. He said the lid itself can be a cool modern park – it has no connection to historical connection because that is gone. He said that two communities gained unique awareness on their own. He said there should be as much detail as possible in the RFP documents to achieve all of this. He said the soil volume should be prescriptive to support planting, so they aren't able to do averaging to save money.

Mr. Ketcherside said the early bike connections are important. He noted the post-canal lowering of lake connections and modes of transportation as important to the story. He said to leverage the entry way element and guard rails on freeway elements

on Montlake Boulevard. He said to get back to residential elements, not just a thoroughfare.

Mr. Luoma said that when WSDOT comes back for additional consultation they should focus on edges and adjacent historic neighborhoods.

**051816.5      STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator