



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 603/18

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday October 17, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

The following agenda items were reviewed out of agenda order.

101718.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

101718.41 Lincoln High School
4400 Interlake Avenue N

Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a 12-month extension and noted Seattle Public Schools' desire to complete the major rehab project first.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Lincoln High School, 4400 Interlake Avenue N. for twelve months.

MM/SC/ST/GH 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

101718.42

E.C. Hughes Elementary School

7740 34th Avenue SW

Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a 6-month extension and Seattle Public Schools' desire to complete construction project first. She said they have given SPS a new C&I template for schools.

Mr. Chalana arrived at 3:35 pm.

Ms. Barker asked about damage to a mural.

Ms. Doherty said one was tagged and she didn't know if it has been repaired.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives E.C. Hughes Elementary School, 7740 34th Avenue SW for six months.

MM/SC/KJ/GH 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself

101718.43

Magnolia Elementary School

2418 28th Avenue W

Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a 12-month extension. She said that rehab and the new addition are underway.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives Magnolia Elementary School, 2418 28th Avenue W for twelve months.

MM/SC/ST/GH 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself

101718.44

Loyal Heights Elementary School

2501 NW 80th Street

Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a 6-month extension. Similar comment as E.C. Hughes negotiations.

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

MM/SC/KJ/GH 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself

101718.45 Daniel Webster Elementary School
3014 NW 67th School
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said briefings for a major rehabilitation have been presented; there is no Certificate of Approval yet. She explained Seattle Public Schools requested a 24-month extension.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker asked if security issues have been addressed.

Ms. Doherty said that a lot of the windows are boarded up.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives Daniel Webster Elementary School, 3014 NW 67th School for twenty-four months.

MM/SC/ST/GH 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself

101718.1 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

101718.11 Columbia City Landmark District
4741 Rainier Ave. S.
Proposed signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed installation of vinyl window decal business signs. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. The Hasegawa Professional Building was constructed in 1958. It is a non-contributing building within the Columbia City National Register District. On October 2, 2018 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Following Committee review, the Committee members recommended approval of the application, as proposed.

Applicant Comment:

Jenna Beem said the background is transparent and logo and text are white for visibility from Rainier.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said it was reasonable.

Mr. Coney arrived at 3:43 pm.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage at 4741 Rainier Ave. S., as proposed

This action is based on the following:

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

Guidelines/Specific

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

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

- a. **Window Signs and Hanging Signs.** Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 and 10

MM/SC/RF/GH 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Coney abstained.

101718.12 Columbia City Landmark District
3811 S. Ferdinand St.
Proposed signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed installation of a 48" w x 18" h hanging sign, to be installed via existing eye-hooks in the soffit. She said the sign is made of composite materials, routed out. Sign will be moved to be symmetrical with adjacent business sign. The proposed sign is the same size as others. Responding to questions she said the sign won't interfere with head clearance and the cream color relates to her logo. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. The Peirson Apartment Building was constructed in 1908. It is a contributing building within the Columbia City National Register District. The Landmarks Preservation Board approved a similar sign in this location for a prior business in December 2017. On October 2, 2018 the Columbia City

Review Committee reviewed the application. Following Committee review, the Committee members recommended approval of the application, as proposed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members determined it was reasonable.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs at 3811 S. Ferdinand St., as proposed

This action is based on the following:

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

Guidelines/Specific

11. Signs.

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

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

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

a. Window Signs and Hanging Signs.

Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 and 10

MM/SC/DB/GH 10:00 Motion carried.

101718.13

Columbia City Landmark District

4915 Rainier Ave. S.

Proposed street use and design

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed sidewalk café to feature a rail table (materials: Douglas fir and blackened steel) and chairs for Limeña. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. This two-story commercial building was constructed in 2014. It is a non-contributing building within the Columbia City National Register District. On February 21, 2018, the Landmarks Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations for a storefront remodel and paint colors. On October 2, 2018 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee reviewed an alternate table and chairs configuration. Following Committee review and deliberations, the Committee members recommended approval of the application's preferred design, as proposed.

Applicant Comment:

Miriam Hinden explained the proposed sidewalk café will occupy less than half of the sidewalk, leaving the rest for the pedestrian zone. She said the tile was pre-approved, so they could see how it will coordinate. She said they left 3' clear for Fire Department connection.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kiel said it is reasonable and activation is good.

Ms. Johnson said it is an improvement.

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

This action is based on the following:

The proposed street use and design meets the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

Guidelines/Specific

7. Street Use. Any work that affects a street, alley, sidewalk, or other public right-of-way, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board. Emphasis shall be placed on creating and maintaining pedestrian-oriented public spaces and rights-of-way. Street trees and other plant materials that add human enjoyment to the District shall be encouraged. Decorative treatments within the sidewalk, including special paving patterns and building entryway tiling shall be preserved. The use of alleys for services and public-oriented activities shall be encouraged.

8. Street Furniture. All elements of street furniture, including but not limited to street lights,

benches, trash receptacles, and planters, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board as to their specific compatibility with the District. Street furniture must be appropriately sized and sited to afford generous provisions for pedestrian flow.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 and 10

MM/SC/ST/GH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

101718.14 Columbia City Landmark District
3610 S. Edmunds St.
Proposed signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed revision to PCC signage, reflecting updated branding. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. The Angeline is a non-contributing building within the Columbia City National Register District. On October 2, 2018 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Following Committee review, the Committee members recommended approval of the application, as proposed.

Applicant Comment:

Jess Vahedian said they are rebranding.

Matt Palosa said PCC dropped 'Natural' from its name.

Ms. Vahedian said all signage will go in existing locations, using same mountings and same footprint. She said west-facing signage is non-illuminated aluminum, pin-mounted to rain screen. The PCC neon replacement will be internally illuminated and a bit larger than existing; color is going from purple to white now. The blade sign will re-use the existing armature and there will be no new penetrations; color is blue with yellow. The community name is in the logo. She said over the east elevation they will re-use the existing mounting for the same sized sign. She said the sign is double-sided, color is dark blue with light blue.

Ms. Barker asked what is on the back of the internally lit sign to prevent glare.

Ms. Vahedian said it is solid aluminum on back.

Public comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Treffers said the proposal is consistent with what is there already.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs at 3610 S. Edmunds St., as proposed

This action is based on the following:

The proposed signs meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

Guidelines/Specific

11. Signs.

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

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

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

b. Window Signs and Hanging Signs. Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.

d. Blade Signs. Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

g. Sign Lighting. Sign lighting should be subdued and incandescent. Back-lit signs are prohibited. Signs that flash, blink, vary in intensity, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion shall not be permitted.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 and 10

MM/SC/DB/GH 10:00 Motion carried.

101718.15 Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena & Northwest Rooms & International Fountain Pavilion
305 Harrison Street
Proposed additions, alterations and rehabilitation

Ms. Doherty provided an overview of the proposed work. Preliminary design of a new 35,700sf glass addition to the south side of the Arena, including removal of the original south curtain wall framing and glazing. Removal of the non-historic west,

south, and east plazas for the excavation and shoring of proposed below-grade expansion of the Arena and parking, capped by a new raised plaza, similar in elevation to the original ground plane. Selective removal of the south edge of the north plaza, for excavation and shoring within the Arena project boundary. Removal of non-designated buildings and structures directly south of the Arena and north of Thomas Street. Preliminary design of new above-grade perimeter buildings to accommodate Arena egress, exiting, ticketing, and garage elevator; including an addition to the south end of the Northwest Rooms, and the deconstruction/reconstruction of the south end of the International Fountain Pavilion. Selective removal, storage and reinstallation of the Arena's west, north, and east curtain wall framing and glazing. Selective removal, storage and reinstallation of pre-cast concrete architectural panels from the south end of the International Fountain Pavilion and the upper north plaza. Selective removal, storage and reinstallation of artwork in the upper and lower north plazas. Removal of two legacy trees from the lower north plaza, and selective removal of small trees and plantings within the Arena project boundary.

Todd Spangler, Populous, said they worked through a variety of options before coming to the final design solution. He said they are seeking approval of a Preliminary Certificate of Approval. He went over historic conditions and said their number one goal is to pay homage to the original design and undo some of the transformations that had been done. He went over existing conditions and what is proposed. He said they will bring the original relation to grade. On the south façade they will clear away buildings to allow for expansion of atrium. On the west, they will fill in arched stairways and bring grade back to 1962 levels. On the north, they will provide visibility down through the space. The arena will be expanded in footprint; it will be lowered 15' and expanded beyond existing glass line.

Garreth Loveridge, Swift Company said plantings and buildings have changed over time. He proposed mechanical and egress on the southwest be pulled into one structure; the area is vegetated with trees.

Mr. Spangler said the sound end will be the new front door.

Mr. Loveridge went over proposed tree removal and said some will be donated / replanted within Seattle Center, some at Arboretum, one will go to Kubota Gardens. He said the north end exceptional trees will be salvaged for timber and for zoo habitat. He said legacy trees need removal and he noted the sequoia root system is problematic; he said there is no way to save it.

Mr. Spangler went over details on page 23 noting the flat roof will be saved; the egress stair is in the middle and four doors are needed for egress, mechanical exhaust. He said they will match as many details as possible. He said they will leave the existing Thirty panels in place.

Mr. Loveridge said there are no plants along the base, the panels will be fully exposed.

He said the new glass curtain wall at the ticket office will be differentiated from existing. The historic curtain wall will be disassembled, cataloged, stored, treated for lead, repainted and reinstalled. He said if mullion color contrast is desired, they can

upgrade to a dark gray. He said there will be a structural modification at the south pylon. He said there is an art opportunity at the upper plaza. Southwest of arena he said the exhaust and mechanical have been reduced in size and integrated into stairs. He said they have opened up the corner and the stair is enclosed with architectural fence which he noted is a green wall opportunity.

Mr. Loveridge said they will plant shrubs and vines along the edge where the trees are.

Mr. Spangler went over Northwest Rooms Building on page 58; he compared historic, current and proposed conditions.

Mr. Loveridge said the overlook protrudes into plaza in plan.

Mr. Coney asked if they will repurpose Thirty panels for the south.

Mr. Spangler said no, they will use perforated panels and concrete panels on east, west, and south.

Ms. Doherty said they will come back with those materials and mockups.

Mr. Loveridge said the greenery will minimize foundation wall. Responding to clarifying question he said the tree locations as rendered in drawings are accurate.

Departures

Kris Wilson, Perkins Coie, explained the new departure review/approval process and said they think the departures better protect the landmark.

1. Addition of Glass Atrium Lobby (north site) allows preservation of exterior and addition of square footage below grade
2. Set back would interfere with mechanical structure placement to prevent impacts to landmark building
3. Curtain wall – method of measurement
4. Open space for south site - prioritize that area for accessory parking and preservation of Bressi Garage, use of south site loading dock better achieves goals
5. Existing surface parking for ADA, impossible to meet code

Ms. Doherty said the surface parking is accessible for vans that are too tall for garage.

Mr. Treffers asked what happened with the southeast corner with regard to federal review with DAHP.

Mr. Spangler said they will bring back transparency and match existing grade to interior concourse.

Mr. Loveridge said it is currently a concrete wall, the back of ticket area and could possibly be a vine wall.

Ms. Doherty clarified that they are changing from concrete to glass, but it will be differentiated from other glass, it will be butt-glazed here.

Mr. Coney asked about the second level on the elevator structure.

Mr. Spangler said it is a public elevator for the garage on non-event days; it will be used for campus and staff.

Mr. Chalana asked about landscape that it relates to modernist landscape design.

Mr. Loveridge said they pulled the landscape away from façade to reveal glass, it is a cleaner look. On the north side, the ADA ramp was introduced and they want to keep the ground plane calm and low.

Mr. Freitas asked about the sycamore trees.

Mr. Loveridge said they will be only at the perimeter. He said on the south side the trees will be in the 25-30- range, deciduous.

Mr. Freitas said the two exceptional trees would make a great donation but is there mitigation for adverse effect? He asked if there will be an intentional gesture to mitigate the loss of historic material.

Mr. Loveridge said the north courtyard redesign they will replace at least one significant tree in similar location. He said they will bring back five significant-scaled trees; they will use Beech 2:1 to overcompensate.

Mr. Coney asked about Thiry panels on the NASA room.

Mr. Loveridge said they will not be salvaged.

Mr. Treffers asked about removal of the Thiry panels and how they will be protected.

Ms. Doherty said detail about removal, storage, and reinstallation is on the last page of the packet. There is no plan to keep the NASA panels as the building was not designated. She said they can be stored on site but if they leave, they must go to a licensed and bonded facility.

Jill Crary said they will be stored within the construction zone.

Mr. Treffers said that the sub-contractor should know what they are doing and asked if that will be written into the RFP. He said to make sure that they are qualified to do the work.

Ms. Barker asked if it would be possible to retain the NASA panels on site until the project is finish in case there is damage to the Thiry panels.

Shawn Mason, CAA/ICON, said the NASA panels are larger than the Northwest Room panels.

Mr. Coney said they could be cut.

Mr. Kiel said the NASA building was not landmarked and it not part of the discussion; the board has no purview over them.

Mr. Coney noted possible destruction of panel that could be replaced with something of that time.

Ms. Doherty said it might be good insurance to save a couple.

Mr. Treffers made a strong recommendation to save the panels.

Mr. Chalana said there is intentional landscape design here that is part of the original scheme.

Mr. Freitas said they are not doing restoration.

Mr. Chalana said they are trying to reestablish relationship with plaza and building with grade. He wondered if there is any original landscape design that could be brought back.

Mr. Loveridge said the ground plane is a big part. He said it used to be gated but now it is open and accessible; they want to keep it safe and open and to make more open spaces. They are using similar typologies in different locations. The only thing that remains are the trees at perimeter.

Ms. Barker said at the south side loading dock vegetation was eliminated.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said she sat through briefings and is pleased with the progress. She said she hated having the vehicular ingress / egress on the south site. She said the idea of green walls came about quickly and she said she is concerned with where they would be implemented. She hoped they will come back to ARC in case there are any surprises. She said she wants to know about green walls up front. She said she is pleased with the way things have progressed. She said she would be OK if they eliminated the vehicle access. She was OK with departures.

Ms. Johnson was comfortable with the proposal and the departures. She said the zoning is not intended for a place like this.

Mr. Kiel said the departures were OK. He liked the approach to bracketing the site. He said in a nice way it is a nod to historic closed campus. He said the addition is impactful and respectful. He said they are highlighting the existing center and reinstating the original grade is good.

Mr. Coney said it is impactful to raise it back up to grade. He noted truck access was added and it is good not to impact Bressi Garage. He appreciated the responsiveness. He said green factor can be minimized and green walls are not attractive. He said the northwest corner is lacking in solution and interrupts the whole corner. He suggested stockpiling Thirty panels would benefit Seattle Center as a whole.

Mr. Treffers noted the team's responsiveness to the board. He said he was supportive of the project and said it is sensitive to the original structure. He said it meets the objectives and it will be a vibrant building again. He said to hire qualified contractors to retain and handle the historic material. Thirty panels – as mitigation – should be preserved and offered to MOHAI as an opportunity to mitigate impacts. He supported the project and said they are going in the right direction.

Mr. Coney was concerned about color change of mullions.

Ms. Doherty said all materials, colors, details, etc. will come to the board in the Final C of A.

Mr. Chalana was concerned about landscaping and said it is one site. He asked how it connects with the rest of the campus and how the campus was conceived. He said it is greener than originally intended. He wanted to see it more in context with the rest of the campus.

Ms. Barker said the planting palette details are part of the final C of A.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Preliminary Certificate of Approval for the proposed height, bulk, and scale of the proposed additions and alterations to the building exteriors and site of the Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena, and Northwest Rooms & International Fountain Pavilion, at 305 Harrison Street, as per the attached submittal.

Although the preliminary design illustrates overall intent for the buildings and site, the scope of this application does not include approval of final details, materials, colors, patterns, textures, lighting, planting palette, signage, new artwork, video displays, equipment, and other exterior features/furnishings. The scope of this application does not include proposed alterations to other designated features of the landmarks.

EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS

This action is based on the following:

1. The Preliminary Certificate of Approval is approved on the condition of subsequent submittal and Landmarks Board approval of the final design as outlined in a separate Final Certificate of Approval application.
2. The applicant is responsible for providing documentation of the licensed and bonded facility, where designated historic materials from the buildings and sites will be stored and protected during construction. The selective removal and salvage efforts may not begin until the required information has been provided to the Landmarks Board Coordinator and the applicant has received the Coordinator's permission to proceed.
3. This approval does not include the vehicle tunnel, proposed to be mined beneath the Bressi Garage buildings, nor any proposed alterations to the designated features of the Bressi Garage. The tunnel scope of work may not proceed until the Landmarks Board Coordinator has reviewed a fully engineered design and the proposed construction monitoring plan and has confirmed that the work does not appear to

adversely impact the designated features of the landmark, and that reasonable measures are proposed to mitigate impacts to the landmark.

4. The applicant is responsible for providing to the Landmarks Board Coordinator documentation of a construction monitoring plan for the Century 21 Coliseum / Key Arena, and Northwest Rooms & International Fountain Pavilion, demonstrating that reasonable measures are proposed to mitigate impacts to the landmarks.
5. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance No. 124584 and 125642.*
 - a. While the proposal includes a major addition to the south side of the Coliseum/Arena, the preliminary massing, scale, and character of the addition are subservient to the iconic form of the landmark. Except for removing the original south curtainwall and some non-historic glazing and louvers, the exterior building envelope will be preserved, and the plaza relationship returned to its original form.
 - b. While the proposal includes an addition to the Northwest Rooms, the original concrete bas-relief panels on the south end will remain intact, in the event the addition is removed in the future.
6. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, *the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.*
 - a. The applicant provided extensive information to the ARC and Landmarks Board throughout preliminary design development. The team demonstrated the programmatic need for additional interior space at the Arena and showed that an above-grade addition at the south end was the only suitable location. They mitigated further programmatic expansion by locating these spaces beneath the plaza level.
7. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 C, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change may be necessary to meet the requirements of any other law, statute, regulation, code or ordinance.*
 - a. The applicant explained the necessity for the quantity, size and distribution of exits and mechanical ventilation, and presented options and alternatives to the ARC and Landmarks Board for the proposed above-grade portals. They were responsive to the Board members' feedback for ways to mitigate impacts to the Landmarks.
8. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 D and 25.12.750 E are not applicable.
9. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

Standard #5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

Standard #6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard #10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/DB/KJ 10:0:0 Motion carried.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board directs their staff to prepare a written letter to the Director of the Department of Construction and Inspections recommending approval for the following departures as outlined in a memo from the DLR Group dated October 5, 2018 and as illustrated on drawing "Departures Site Diagram":

1. Arena Depth and Width - Addition of Glass Atrium Lobby (north site)
2. Structure Setback and Landscaping - New Accessory Structures (north site)
3. Blank Façade and Transparency - Arena and Accessory Structures (north site)
4. Usable Open Space (south site)
5. Screening of Street-Level Accessory Parking (south site)

This action is pursuant to SMC 25.12.735, and is consistent with the Preliminary Certificate of Approval as submitted to and approved by the Landmarks Preservation Board on October 17, 2018.

MM/SC/GH/ST 10:0:0 Motion carried.

101718.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES *continued*

101718.46 Seattle Times Office Building Addition
1120 John Street
Request for extension

Jessica Clawson said the MUP should be ready soon and asked for extension to March 6, 2019.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Office Building Addition, 1120 John Street, to March 6, 2019.

MM/SC/DB/GH 9:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Chalana abstained.

101718.47 Seattle Times Printing Plant
1120 John Street

Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Seattle Times Printing Plant, 1120 John Street to March 6, 2019.

MM/SC/ST/GH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

101718.48 Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co Building
1525 11th Avenue
Request for extension

Jessica Clawson requested extension.

Ms. Sodt said the new property manager has reached out to staff.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co Building, 1525 11th Avenue, to March 6, 2019.

MM/SC/DB/KJ 10:0:0 Motion carried.

101718.49 White Motor Company Building
1021 E. Pine Street
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the White Motor Company Building, 1021 E. Pine Street, to March 6, 2019.

MM/SC/ST/GH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

101718.410 Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store
400 Westlake Avenue
Request for extension

Jack McCullough said they are working through the MUP process and asked for extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store, 400 Westlake Avenue, to March 6, 2019.

MM/SC/RF/GH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

101718.411 Federal Reserve Bank Building
1015 Second Avenue
Request for extension

Jack McCullough said they have the MUP and will start construction; he requested an extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Federal Reserve Bank Building, 1015 Second Avenue, to March 6, 2019.

MM/SC/GH/KJ 10:0:0 Motion carried.

101718.412 Franklin Apartments
2302 4th Ave
Request for extension

Jack McCullough said they will come back to get massing approved. He said he thought they would sell the project to a builder. He said the police have gone in and secured the building; he said he will tell the owners again.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Franklin Apartments, 2302 4th Avenue, to March 6, 2019.

MM/SC/RC/DB 10:0:0 Motion carried.

101718.413 Mama's Mexican Kitchen Building
2234 2nd Avenue
Request for extension

Jack McCullough said it is a challenge and they are working on a proforma; he requested an extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Mama's Mexican Kitchen Building, 2234 2nd Avenue, to March 6, 2019.

MM/SC/ST/GH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

101718.414 Lloyd Building
901 Stewart Street
Request for extension

Jack McCullough said they in concept exploration and conversations on addition are continuing.

Ms. Barker noted it has taken a long time and if the owner could take care of this.

Mr. McCullough said it is a challenge because it is a small site with low floor to floor height. He said the property owner needs to find someone with development vision to tie up with the parking lot next door. He said by signing Controls we waive the ability to talk about the economic piece. He said they will find a developer first. He said the building is not going anywhere.

Ms. Barker said she would love to have it done and call it good; it is a designated landmark.

Mr. McCullough said it is more productive to pursue other paths.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Lloyd Building, 901 Stewart Street, to March 6, 2019.

MM/SC/RF/GH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

101718.415 White Garage
1915 Third Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt said the owner requested a four-month extension; they are in the queue for full board briefing.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the White Garage, 1915 Third Avenue, to March 6, 2019.

MM/SC/DB/GH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

101718.2 DESIGNATION

101718.21 Mount Baker Community Club Clubhouse
2811 Mount Rainier Drive South

Spencer Howard provided context of the site. The Community Clubhouse was built in 1914; it was designed by architect Charles C. Dose. The building is located on a sloped site between South Mount Baker Park Boulevard and Mount Rainier Drive South. Road grading, if any, pre-1929, there is nothing in the records when or if this work occurred. The clubhouse is a Craftsman style building comprised of two sections. There is an east facing gambrel roof portion and a west facing gable roof portion. It has a wood frame structure, with original shingle and clapboard cladding. The roof features broad eaves, prominent barge boards, knee braces, and shed roof dormers. Original wood sash, one over one and multi-lite windows provide day lighting and ventilation for interior spaces. The main entrance is on the east side of the building off Mount Rainier Drive South. Due to the sloped site there are 1.5 stories above grade on the east, and 2.5 stories above grade on the west side. The interior layout is oriented towards clubhouse functions. The ground floor, accessed from the west side, consists of preschool classrooms and storage areas. The mid-level ballroom serves as the main function space for gatherings. This ballroom is a large open volume with support spaces grouped at the east side. The upper mezzanine level overlooking the ballroom serves as meeting space. An interior stairwell and vestibule off the east entrance links the ballroom and mezzanine levels. Interior finishes consist of original painted wood casings and trim, wood floors, and painted plaster and gypsum board walls and ceilings.

The Mount Baker Park Addition was platted in 1907 by the Hunter Tract Development Company. The developers had purchased 130 acres and hired George Cotterill to design the addition. Landscape architect Edward Schwagerl worked on the landscape portion of the new addition, with the Sawyer Brothers executing

engineering features on the 70-block subdivision. Boulevards winding through the addition and a series of parks where key amenities within the addition. The developers promoted the addition as an upper-income residential community – with deed restrictions requiring minimum setbacks and a minimum investment value for structures built on lots. The development company allocated funds for various site improvements within the addition, one of which was a community clubhouse. The clubhouse was marketed as an amenity for the neighborhood. However, despite the club showing up in these early advertisements for the neighborhood, an actual clubhouse was not constructed until 1914.

The new addition amenities were marketed and showed the caliber of properties constructed within the neighborhood. He went over an aerial view and map showing the layout of the addition and another showing the streetcar line running up McClellan Street. He indicated the community clubhouse's location in relation. The club, then known as the Mount Baker Park Improvement Club, was established ca. 1908 and incorporated in 1910. "Get Together: Get Busy: Boost!" was the club's motto – and the purpose of the club was to promote the physical development of the Mount Baker Park, encourage homeowners to develop and improve their property, and to organize and aid other neighborhood clubs to benefit the community. By 1923, the club was one of about 50 in the city. The Phinney Ridge Improvement club was the first known community club established in the city, founded in 1900.

He reported on community Club accomplishments over the last 50 years. He said during the 1960s and 1970s, the club worked in the effort to stop red-lining collusion practice of all the Seattle banks. By 1969, all the Seattle banks refused to lend on Mount Baker housing - they referred buyers and brokers to use "mezzanine" mortgage brokers instead of bank financing. Eventually, Bob Cotten, from the Madison Valley branch of University S & L stepped up in late 1973. Energizing the entire community to petition the city for the Housing Rehabilitation Program - 76% of the homeowners signed the petition and committed everyone to house-by-house inspection to bringing their homes up to code even if they don't qualify for financial support. Adjusted Clubhouse spaces to accommodate the Housing Rehab Program - later re-programmed for the Daycare Center. Work to save Franklin High School from being demolished and replaced by a school at Genesee Park. Coordinated the largest integrated underground wiring program in state history by having seven adjacent separate yet contiguous LIDs. Coordinated light post and lighting fixtures choices. Worked with the Mount Baker Youth Service Bureau to dig trenches and help snake wiring in private yards. Started ca. 1969 and have sustained the annual MB Home Tour every December as the club's largest fund raiser. This tour was started as statement of Mount Baker's vitality in the face of redlining by the banks. The Club supported the quality of neighborhood life with activities for children at the Clubhouse. The Club organized the largest volunteer-run Food Coop in the state with over 140 families, spanning the entire Mount Baker Community, organized to order and distribute healthy food through a coordinated effort at the Clubhouse. Secured a Community Block Grant two years in a row to design and build the Horton Hill steps as a nice pathway between the hill top and John Muir School. Sustained a schedule of Holiday Dances at the Clubhouse to continue its role as the home of ballroom dancing. Welcomed the Hmong Tribe immigrants with a celebration in the park and reprogrammed Clubhouse spaces for them to have an office for immigrant training at the Clubhouse.

For the Mount Baker Park Improvement Club, all property owners had one share of stock in the club. The club had a variety of sub-committees, including Streets & Public Improvements, Entertainment, Public Safety, and Restrictions. Early efforts by the club included advocating for the construction of a new fire station, installation of a new sewer, street paving, and better police protection. One of the more active committees was the “Restrictions Committee,” which was charged with enforcing the restrictions contained in the deeds regarding the construction of only single-family housing, and the restrictive covenants that prevented non-whites and other minorities from purchasing property in the area. The club also passed a resolution stating that the club was against using any lot for clubs, schools, boarding or lodging houses, churches, charitable or religious societies or orders, or for any other purpose than strictly detached family residences. One of their first issues they tackled was to pursue a lawsuit with the recently opened Catholic Ursuline Seminary/Convent (at 2745 Mount Saint Helens Place). The restrictions enforced by the “Restrictions Committee” extended beyond restrictions ensuring the neighborhood’s aesthetic standards to outright racial and ethnic discrimination. This type of discrimination occurred early in the development’s history and continued for several decades. Despite the harsh actions of the Restrictions Committee, by the early 1960s Mount Baker had begun to change from an all-white to an interracial neighborhood, with an influx of residents of Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Vietnamese, and Korean descent. A group of younger residents led the drive to change the attitude towards persons of color. In 1967-68, the club formed a Committee to Revitalize Mount Baker, aimed at eliminating the earlier racial discrimination and developing new bylaws to reorient the mission of the club.

To reflect the changing times and demographics of the neighborhood, the club changed its name to the Mount Baker Community Club in 1968 and revised the bylaws to open the membership to all residents (not just property owners in the Mount Baker Park Addition) of Mount Baker. The leadership of the Club also became more diverse during this time. Matthew Hudson, a black teacher who along with his wife, Bea, worked to decentralize Seattle schools, served as vice president of the Club in 1968. Vera Ing, a Chinese-American urban planner and community activist served as president of the Club. Since the shift in the 1960s away from the club’s earlier exclusivity, the club has continued to promote diversity, both in the neighborhood and its own leadership.

Mr. Howard reported on Seattle community clubs. He said that extant buildings were all purpose built, except for the Jefferson Park Ladies’ Improvement Club and include Mount Baker Park Improvement Club, Women’s Lakewood Civic Improvement Club, Haller Lake Improvement Club, Jefferson Park Ladies’ Improvement Club, Sunset Hill Improvement Club. Mount Baker was the earliest club house use, 1914; the rest started club house uses between 1919 and 1928.

Mr. Howard said that Charles Does was one of the original board of directors for the Community Club. He said the design is unique within his portfolio as a club house. The building blends Craftsman and some Colonial style elements. Such eclecticism was typical of the era and many of the dwellings in the surrounding neighborhood reflect this rich blending of stylistic elements. While Seattle architect, Charles L. Haynes, was the official architect for the Hunter Tract Improvement Company and designed many houses in Mount Baker Park, architect Charles C. Dose lived in the neighborhood and was on the executive committee for the Improvement Club at the

time. He developed his design for the clubhouse based on an earlier proposal by architect Ellsworth Storey. Dose, along with his father, platted the Dose Addition north of the Mount Baker Park Addition. Charles C. Dose designed several houses in the subdivision and the Dose family would live in one house as they built the next one. They then sold the first house, moved into a new one, and built another. The Dose family, especially Mrs. Charles C. (Phoebe) Dose, were actively involved in the creation of the Mount Baker Park Improvement Club.

Dose and his partners published “Architecture of Dose, West & Reinoehl,” a 120-page plan book catalog in 1908. The catalog depicted over 70 plans for residential and commercial designs, ranging from small cottages to a fireproof hotel building. The partners also used the plan book to advertise their construction loan services. The catalog identifies Reinoehl as the firm’s architect, West as the superintendent (likely construction superintendent), and Dose as the business manager and construction loan coordinator. However, by January 1909, Claude Reinoehl had moved to Los Angeles and the company was renamed C.C. Dose & Company, Architects. After this, all newspaper articles regarding projects cite the C.C. Dose & Company as the “architect” or “architects.” While any formal architectural training of Charles C. Dose is unknown, Charles C. identified his profession as “architect” in the 1910 US Census. Washington State did not begin to formally license architects until 1919 and prior to that time the term was rather loosely applied, and Charles C. Dose never obtained an architectural license. The firm continued to build and design homes into the late teens.

For the Improvement Club building, Dose created a hybrid style building which blended both Craftsman and some Colonial style elements. Such eclecticism was typical of the era and many of the dwellings in the surrounding neighborhood reflect this rich blending of stylistic elements. He provided other examples of Dose’s work – the C.P. Dose House and a house at 2609 Mt St Helens Place. The other two are his designs but their locations are unknown.

Today the Mount Baker Community Club clubhouse continues to be the heart of Mount Baker neighborhood and it remains focused on its mission as a place to bring residents together to meet each other, to serve as a venue to discuss issues of importance to the neighborhood, and to host a variety of cultural events. Additionally, the building retains a high-level architectural integrity and still retains the characteristics from its original construction date of 1914.

Responding to questions Mark Hannum said the ballroom floor is original, there are some new windows, and the upper area – ceiling and trusses – were replaced after the fire. He said that the radiators are original, floors are on their last sanding. He said that replacement windows are wood, true divided light; they are original dimensions and read exactly the same.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, commended the Mt. Baker Community Club for nomination; she said the building is important to the City.

Eugenie Woo, Historic Seattle, concurred. She appreciated the volunteer nomination. She said Historic Seattle has held meetings there and it is an amazing building.

Rob Ketcherside, Capitol Hill Historical Society, said it is a great building and merits designation on criteria C, D, and E. He said to check the SPU engineering vault for street grading information.

Mr. Chalana asked if there were any interior photos found at UW.

Mr. Howard said no, only exterior.

Mr. Coney asked about the two different roofs – gable and gambrel.

Mr. Hannum said he thought the gambrel roof was done to match the next-door building but that he couldn't find anything else.

Ms. Doherty noted that the club initially met in the neighboring building.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation on Criterion C. He said it is interesting and C is relevant at every iteration from redlining fight back and great architecture. He didn't support inclusion of interior.

Mr. Chalana supported designation and inclusion of the interior including the lobby which he said is spatially intact and an integral part of the clubhouse.

Ms. Barker supported designation with inclusion of the lobby, entrance and two flights, and volume and said it felt genuine and true. She said you couldn't tell the difference in ballroom windows. She said there have been some ADA additions.

Ms. Durham said to be careful about including interior; interiors should be the exception and not the rule because of the hardship it puts on the owner. She said interiors need to be remarkable to building and history.

Mr. Chalana said he meant the ballroom and not the lobby.

Mr. Treffers agreed and said that ballroom is the place to include as it plays to the significance of the space.

Mr. Hodgins said there is drop ceiling, brass lights. He said the building is nice and maintained.

Mr. Freitas said if interiors were included, the ballroom would be it.

Ms. Durham appreciated the owner nomination. She said she loves the role the community clubs played in Seattle development. She said this is a great example of building and organization. She said it has had the same continuous use from the beginning to now. She said its relationship with redlining and then combatting is it interesting. She supported designation of exterior and site, criteria C, D, and E.

Ms. Johnson supported designation based on criteria C, D, and E. She said the building is significant to the neighborhood and she appreciated the stewardship.

Mr. Treffers supported designation on criteria C, D, and E per the Staff Report. He thanked the presenter for additional information provided.

Mr. Coney supported designation on the Staff Report and appreciated the good stewardship.

Mr. Freitas supported designation on criteria C, D, and E and noted the variety, scale of engagement. He said the building was remarkable and he noted its eclecticism.

Ms. Barker supported designation. She appreciated the tour and noted how alive the building is and that she felt the energy of the building. She supported criteria C and D. She didn't support Criterion E because it isn't an outstanding work of Dose's, it was more a marketing tool

Mr. Chalana supported designation on criteria C, and D. He supported inclusion of the ballroom which he said is significant to the building.

Mr. Hodgins said the structure has evolved to meet the needs over time.

Mr. Chalana said it is nice to protect things; designating the ballroom protects it from being chopped up into pieces. He said the club have been good stewards here but that is not always the case.

Mr. Guo supported designation on criteria C and D.

Mr. Kiel supported designation on Criterion C for its use as community space and the ability to convey that.

Mr. Treffers noted it was rebuilt after the fire.

Ms. Doherty noted that the Board included "volume" at the UW Canoe House interior.

Mr. Freitas supported designation with no interior inclusion.

Mr. Hannum said it is less proscriptive to not include ballroom.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Mount Baker Community Club Clubhouse at 2811-2815 Mount Rainier Drive South as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C & D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site and the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/GH/RF 10:00 Motion carried.

Ms. Barker left at 6:15 pm.

101718.3 NOMINATION

101718.31 Roy Vue Apartments 615 Bellevue Avenue East

Full report in DON file.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said the building was constructed in 1924.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, provided context of the site and neighborhood. He said that the building was constructed in an already built-out residential district on the only block with adjacent empty parcels which had never been built on. He reported that the new street car facilitated rapid development of Capitol Hill and small-scale commercial development.

He said the building is prominent and takes up most of the block; the building drops down in elevation with steep hill on the north side. He said a garden courtyard was built on garage rooftop. He noted the formal façade, street level apartment façade, cast-stone belt courses, parapet with three projecting gables, shield medallions and the courtyard in back with central portal providing a view through. He said the north and south elevations are restrained in ornamentation. He said that all windows have been changed, wood sash replaced with vinyl, but the frames remain. Vertical bays still have original windows. He said there was a fountain and pond in the center of the courtyard. He said that Aaron Luoma, former board member and landscape architect, said that original plants may not remain, but they have been replaced with similar. He said original two pergolas are gone but patios remain.

Mr. Murdock explained the circulation patterns and noted the six entrances on interior courtyard remove the need for interior corridors. He said service stairs front to Roy and Bellevue, landings held refrigerators. He said there were three original apartments in the basement, five maid quarters and a maid washroom. He said basement housed storage, boiler and laundry. He said the second and third floors have identical plans, breezeway and two-bedroom apartments. He said the entry stairway has original mosaic tile; he noted the balusters and newel posts. He said the apartments were higher-end and had features of homes including refrigerators, hardwood floors, cabinet coolers for vegetables, ceramic tile in bathroom and kitchen. He noted the multiple windows in each apartment and the quality of light. He said many of the original short tubs remain as do one-bedroom bed closets.

He said the courtyard apartment was adapted from Southern California for Seattle use; he noted the Victoria, Villa Franca, and Tudor Manor apartments where the courtyards face to the street. He said the Roy Vue format is a street wall with courtyard private; he said that is remarkable.

Ms. Woo reported that architect Charles L. Haynes came to Seattle in 1907 and designed a variety of residential and apartment buildings as well as auto showrooms including Donohoe Garage, Tyson Oldsmobile, Buty House, Hunter Improvement Community House, Dunlap Apartments, Narada Apartments, and Butterworth Mortuary. She said builder Hans Pederson was the most prominent and well-documented builder in the City in the early 19th Century. She said he arrived in Seattle in 1886 and rebuilt district after the fire; he excelled in the boomtime and did hundreds of projects. She said Malmo and

Company designed the landscape at Roy Vue; MOHAI has a Malmo collection and there is a good sense of what they meant to the City's economic heritage. Malmo was in business for 100 years and is the model for the modern-day nursery. She said they created their own nursery stock and provided a great business model; they established the future of landscaping, plants and landscaping services. She said they had 25 acres of greenhouses and fields in Georgetown. In 1962 they were purchased by Ernst Hardware. She said their catalogs were amazing with artwork-like covers.

She said the original owners of the building were Willis and son Guy Bergman. Both were steamship captains with ties to the Klondike Gold Rush who later went into real estate. The Roy Vue is the only building they developed on their own. They later defaulted on the property. She said in 1986 Roy Vue Associates acquired the property and have been good stewards of it.

Tamara Bunnell, Capitol Hill Historical Society, a teacher and resident, spoke of the stability of the place and noted numerous residents stayed a long time: Joseph and Griffith Gluck lived there 50 years, Linda Papasso, 48 years, Charles Haynes lived there 15 years as did his mother. She said stable housing contributes to the neighborhood and the community in the Roy Vue extends out through the larger community. City Treasurer, Samuel Rathburn, lived here as did Earl Eba who played the world series live in his stores. Independent working women lived there, clerks, dressmakers, telephone operators, and a variety of social classes and backgrounds. She said lots of units were shared with family and roommates, many residents carried a tradition of service and connection to the community. Drag queen Robbie Turner lived there.

Ms. Woo said the building has integrity and the garden apartment is integral to the holistic design. She said mature intact plantings remain. She said the building meets criteria D, E, and F and Criterion C for its relationship to Malmo. She said the building is significant of interior layout plan; there are no corridors, each unit has views out to courtyard. There is ample natural light that added to livability in 1924 and now. She said the interior layout is significant to the property.

Ms. Durham asked about community group meetings.

Ms. Woo said they met in personal spaces and in courtyard.

Mr. Freitas asked about landscape maintenance and if there were planting plans.

Ms. Woo said she didn't know if Malmo serviced the landscape. She said SDCI has microfiche and one plan was Charles Haynes hardscape. She said they looked at MOHAI catalog of that era for the plant types available then.

Mr. Freitas wondered if photos existing of planting.

Ms. Woo said they have yet to find historic photos of the courtyard.

Mr. Treffers was intrigued by the courtyard location in back and wondered if there are other examples of that.

Mr. Murdock said the garage rooftop garden is common, but they have not seen any other courtyards flipped in plan.

Mr. Kiel asked how deep garage is.

Mr. Murdock said that the alley is below basement level. He said there is 18"- 24" of soil on top; the trees are small.

Ms. Woo said that SDCI research showed that separate permits were taken out for garage and building although both in the same year.

Ms. Johnson said it is unusual to flip courtyard to the back. She asked about individual stairs.

Mr. Murdock said the view to the courtyard was important.

Ms. Doherty said that Highland Apartments are a bit like that.

Mr. Chalana said it is lovely and asked if it is unreinforced masonry.

Ms. Woo said no.

Mr. Murdock said it is a brick veneer; concrete walls end at foundation.

Mr. Chalana asked about conversion to micro-units.

Mr. Kiel said that is not part of purview here.

Mr. Treffers asked about the context of women living in the building.

Ms. Bunnell said that some buildings were designed for independent living, teachers lived in the Roy Vue, although it was not designed for that. The layout made it accessible.

Mr. Treffers wanted more cultural information about who lived there and if there are similar apartments.

Mr. Coney noted the Sheridan Apartments where the landlord was female, as were the residents. He asked if this is the original building on the lot.

Mr. Murdock said it is, it was not developed until 1924.

Mr. Coney asked why not.

Rob Ketcherside, former board member and member of public, said that Mary Pontius owned it for 20 years and then different banks owned it. Bellevue was originally named for her.

Ms. Woo said that nothing is shown on the lots in the 1905 Sanborn map.

Mr. Freitas asked about electric lights.

Mr. Murdock said there were lights for the garden, the fountain is lit. He said some of the exterior lights are original. Responding to questions he said there was always a gate at entry, mailboxes are in basement, the original three apartments are in basement, maid rooms were combined.

Ms. Johnson was curious if any rotating beds were left.

Property Owner Presentation

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, went over typology. She said that regarding the interior, there is no public benefit of designating private spaces. She said the interior cannot convey significance. She said windows have been replaced, there are different plantings, and there have been signage changes. She said there have been changes to the breezeway, grating was added, replacement tiles in entry and breezeway, and stairs/entry to building management office / apartment. She said the location of garden paths and plantings remain. The style of plantings has changed over time and a heritage tree was removed. She said the rockery along the retaining walls is not consistent with the rest of the building, concrete chunks were used. She said the pergolas were removed and paving was broken up.

She said the building did not meet criteria A, B or C. She said the building is not significant to apartment development in Seattle, there are landmarked buildings in the area, and development was an outgrowth as residential development came up hill. She said the street car is associated with the development of Capitol Hill; this was a street car suburb. The building was part of typical development of the neighborhood. She said the Tudor Style and Garden Court combined morphology with decorative elements. She said Anhalt buildings were in the French Norman style. She said here they have applied elements to the apartment block typology. She noted the use of patterned brick, parapet, and quatrefoils.

David Streatfield said the garden court stated in southern California. He said catalog showed plants collected from all over the world. He said in 1910 there were eighteen nurseries in Seattle, in 1927 there were 24. He said that Tudor style was most associated with garden design apartments. He said that most Anhalt garden apartments used Malmo as supplier. Anhalt later went into competition with Malmo. He noted the simplicity of plantings and u-shape courtyard. He said this building exhibits the typology.

Ms. Mirro said the building fits within the body of Charles Haynes' work. Pederson built many landmarks. Malmo's role was not defined well in the past, it is hard to say Malmo was the designer here.

Mr. Streatfield said that Haynes designed, and Malmo was the supplier.

Ms. Mirro said Criterion F is not applicable because there is no public view of the garden; it is not visible except through the gate. She said it is a private courtyard with limited view from the public right of way. She said it is among several apartment buildings in the neighborhood.

Mr. Freitas asked when the tree was removed.

Ms. Mirro said 2005.

A member of the public said it was two years ago and it was removed because of Dutch Elm disease.

Mr. Chalana said Mr. Streatfield mentioned Malmo's role here.

Ms. Mirro said he supplied plants.

Mr. Chalana said Mr. Streatfield said the drawings by Haynes showed Haynes designed the landscape; it was not substantiated.

Audrey Reda, Johnson Partnership said that two trees along the south courtyard were removed for insurance purposes.

Mr. Hodgins asked if there are pictures of the pergolas.

Ms. Mirro said they researched and found no photos.

Mr. Hodgins asked if they knew they were there.

Ms. Reda said the plans have drawings of them.

Mr. Freitas said hardscape is shown in drawings, not plants.

Mr. Coney asked if landscape design like this is common.

Ms. Mirro said only wealthy people get landscaping. Normal development didn't call for landscape plans; it is hard to substantiate who did it.

Mr. Chalana asked if it is a typical example of the architect's work.

Ms. Mirro said it fits in well.

Mr. Chalana said this building is unique in terms of form and garden and that it is flipped.

Ms. Mirro said the privacy of the garden is unique.

Mr. Chalana said the layout is unique.

Ms. Mirro said the u-shape is common.

Mr. Coney said that all units face the street.

Ms. Mirro said the separate servant stair is not unique.

Mr. Chalana asked about women residents.

Ms. Mirro said that apartment buildings were attractive to women. Bungalow courts provided security and privacy unlike detached homes.

Ms. Reda said there were many married couples at the Roy Vue.

Public Comment;

Hilary Linnweh, resident, said they supported the nomination of the Roy Vue Garden Apartments and said it is more than a façade. She said they believe it meets standards C, D, E and F. She said it is an outstanding work of architect Charles Haynes, builder Hans Pederson, and landscape company, Malmo. She said like many great architects Charles Haynes didn't just design an ornate façade or shell, that was plopped on a plot of land. He designed a thoughtful, fully envisioned living experience. Similar to other great architects, his original plans were not just the exterior, but they were specific in their design down to the layout of the courtyard and interior floor plan to ensure a specific quality of life for residents. If you pick away parts of this building, you lose the architect's, builder's and landscaper's original intent of how the space was to be experienced and inhabited. The exterior, courtyard and interior floorplan and finishes are part of a cohesive experience designed from the outside in. Haynes must have been so convinced of the environs he created that he lived in the buildings for 15 years. He designed the floor plan specifically to create healthy airflow throughout the units. There are large windows that offer views of the courtyard garden, exposure to green space and airflow on multiple sides. Most of the units have original features in place such as hardwood floors, wood crown moldings, original kitchen cabinetry, hexagonal ceramic tile bathroom floors and even an original wall-mounted refrigerator unit. The original tile in the vestibules and the stairwells' original wood handrails are also still intact. All of these are in good condition. She said the Roy Vue is an example of an urban lifestyle that already offers affordable and livable density, without forfeiting green spaces and maintainable and healthy size living spaces. As the city of Seattle moves forward she hope we consider how the spaces we inhabit especially historic ones, impact quality of life, livability and character of the city. She said we need to maintain these spaces so that we don't lose residents to other communities that do. She said buildings like the Roy Vue anchor communities. Now more than ever people long for this connection to something great and to the past. The Roy Vue is part of that tangible connection. Many in the room stood in support of her comments.

Ryan Darcey, resident, supported nomination and said the building is simple, iconic with spacious interiors, green space. He said he found an older newspaper from October 1952 there. He said we must maintain tangible connection to the past.

Ranita Patel, resident, said that the building is special. It is open, airy, bright, lots of light. She said it has original features and fixtures. She said it has original feel. She said the building has been preserved by the owners and tenants. She said the building is a cornerstone of the area.

Noah Green, neighbor, supported nomination. He noted the courtyard on the west side, and the rarity of rear-facing courtyard. He said the units span two sides of the building; most built now don't share this quality. He said the building is vernacular in the spirit the era and Capitol Hill.

Diana James, author of Shared Walls: Seattle Apartments, said the tenants have taken ownership. She noted the value of living in a place with a sense of history. She said it is an imperiled building. She said to save it; it is unique, safe, quirky, housing inside storied walls. She advocated nominating the entire building; the Roy Vue is a jewel and

deserves nomination – inside, outside, and garden. It is an asset to the neighborhood and City.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, said the Narada Apartment building on Queen Anne is one of her favorites in the neighborhood. She was thrilled to see the Roy Vue up for nomination. She applauded Capitol Hill Historical Society for the nomination. She supported nomination on criteria D, E, and F.

Jarrold Pace said he looked through the archway and saw the courtyard and wanted to live there. He put his name on the waiting list. He said he saw this as a place in which to live a long time. He noted the cheap apartments going up now.

Jordan Kowalski has lived in the building for 10 years and won't consider leaving to go anywhere else. He said they have movies in the courtyard, community space, barbeques. He said it is a community.

Jacob Roff said the building is affordable compared to others and is a beautiful place; the courtyard means a lot.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Coney said he knows the building and it is worthy of landmark designation. He said it was part of the golden era of apartment buildings in Seattle. He said all of Capitol Hill should be a district. He supported nomination and noted the reverse courtyard.

Mr. Chalana said it is a no-brainer. He said the building is unique and offers a space for community building. He said to preserve places like this, especially in this time of rapid development.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and noted criteria D and E. She said the reverse courtyard is distinctive in scale and is intact and is specific to its site.

Ms. Durham supported nomination. The siting of the courtyard is unique as are the exterior entrances and interior results. She said with a building like this it is important to pay attention to interior and the entrances off the courtyard gallery.

Mr. Hodgins supported nomination and thanked the public for comments. He said the reverse courtyard is interesting. He said a lot of thought went into the private courtyard.

Mr. Freitas said it is a great adaptation of garden style with courtyard flipped to be non-public. He noted the opportunity to pay attention to landscape as it relates to the landmark and that perhaps a template could be developed for landscapes. He supported nomination and noted Criterion D. He appreciated public comment.

Mr. Treffers thanked the public for their comments and said it means a lot. He supported nomination and said the building is notable in the City. He said Diana James wrote the book on apartments in the City, three former board members support nomination. He said he lived in Los Angeles and that he loves garden apartments. He said he has never seen the courtyard flipped and that is unique to Seattle. He agreed about inclusion of interiors but said it is unique here – the floor plan is unique and significant in this building and interior should be included.

Mr. Kiel said if you are making an argument that the organization of the building and the stairway became a thing to convey typology, it is pretty common.

Ms. Johnson said she had no problem including interior and noted the interior / exterior window and door pattern for now.

Mr. Freitas asked for more information on garden space, path materials, cobblestone.

Mr. Treffers wanted more information about the building's role in Capitol Hill community.

Mr. Hodgins said he was surprised that only two of these were reversed.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Roy Vue Apartments at 615 Bellevue Avenue East for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site; the exterior of the apartment building including the arcade; the building interior; and the courtyard and elevated garden spaces; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for November 21, 2018; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

101718.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator