



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 519/17

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, July 19, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Russell Coney
Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Julianne Patterson
Matthew Sneddon
Emily Vyhnanek

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Deb Barker
Kathleen Durham
Garrett Hodgins
Steven Treffers

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

071917.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 3, 2017

MM/SC/KJ/JP

7:0:0 Minutes approved.

May 17, 2017
MM/SC/KJ/JP

6:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Sneddon abstained.

071917.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

071917.21 International Special Review District
Publix Hotel
504 5th Avenue S

Ms. Frestedt provided an overview of the Special Tax Valuation program. As before and after photos were reviewed by board members she explained that submitted rehabilitation costs were \$13,023,119; eligible rehabilitation costs were \$13,073,811 after a math correction. She said that there were no disallowed costs.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Publix Hotel, 504 5th Ave. S. This action is based upon the criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based upon the recommendation of the International Special Review District Board which made the following findings at its meeting of July 11, 2017; and that the property is a contributing building located in the International Special Review District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the International Special Review District; and has substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application, and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Local Review Board as required by Title 84 RCW, Chapter 449.

MM/SC/RK/EV 7:0:0 Motion carried.

071917.22 Schoenfeld Building
1012 First Avenue

\$ 5,922,442.94

Ms. Sodt reported that the submitted and eligible rehabilitation costs were \$5,922,442.94; there were no disallowed costs.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: the Schoenfeld Building, 1012 First Avenue, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to

application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/RK/EV 7:0:0 Motion carried.

071917.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

071917.31 Queen Anne Library
400 West Garfield Street
Proposed waste bin enclosure and associated landscape

Matt Inpanbutr, SHKS, explained the space where the dumpsters and recycling have been sited is no longer available. He said they will move the dumpsters to the northwest corner of the site. He said landscaping will cover the utility items as well. He said they will put in a concrete pad and enclosure with steel frame and perforated panel gates. He said they will use vegetated panels on three sides. He said that some of the existing hedge will be removed for the enclosure but the remainder will be left.

Mr. Coney said that what is proposed is appropriate and minimal.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside asked if there will be issues with time of service pick up.

Mr. Inpanbutr said that pick up is before 8:00am so there shouldn't be any issues with building users; it will be signed as well.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site improvements at the Queen Anne Library, 400 West Garfield Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed site improvements do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121101, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

071917.32

West Seattle Library
2306 42nd Avenue SW
Proposed alterations to restrooms

Suzanne Kraus, SHKS, said they are making accessible restroom upgrades. She said the only original features in the room are the plaster walls and some wood elements at window. She said the non-original door to toilet room #1 will be replaced by a larger one. She said that it will be a full accessibility upgrade to toilet room #1 only. She said toilet room #2 will have upgrade to finishes and fixtures. She said wall tile will be replaced with 3” x 6” tile; non-original wood frame vanity element will be replaced; and restroom accessories will be library standards.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Kiel said there is no impact to exterior wall.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the toilet configuration is original.

Matt Inpanbutr, SHKS, said that and the floor date back to the mid 1980’s renovation.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interior alterations at the West Seattle Library, 2306 42nd Avenue SW, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed interior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121102, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

071917.33

Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse
2815 Elliott Avenue
Proposed rehabilitation and penthouse addition

Jack McCullough said they look forward to getting started in late August.

Matt Aalfs provided a summary of the project and a history of the building. He said they propose to renovate the building and add a one-story penthouse. He said work will include seismic retrofit, life, safety and energy upgrades. He explained that the 1970's north façade will be restored to original condition. He said they will rehab original windows and will manufacture where needed. He said that they will infill brick where missing and cast stone sills will be used. He said that on the 1970's south façade a non-original opening will be modified and infilled; it will connect to a new mixed-use building and won't be visible outside when the new building goes up.

He said that seismic upgrade will be done; four steel brace frames will be installed. The heavy timber construction will be preserved where possible. He said where the brace frames come in will support timber structures to new system. He said they won't fire and insulate the brick walls and will preserve the relationship between the exposed brick and heavy timber. The fire department connection will be moved to new condition and they will check with the Fire Department to make sure this is OK. He said the palette focuses on restored brick, sandstone detail, arches and new windows. The new penthouse will be neutral so as not to call attention to itself. He said there will be a roof amenity for residents. He said the guard rail will be low and will not be visible from the street.

Mr. Kiel said ARC had positive comments about the project; he noted the light touch of the connection to the new building and the modest penthouse additions.

Ms. Johnson said she liked the project all along. She noted refinements made and said it works well with the building.

Mr. Coney said they scaled back the penthouse, pulled the utilities down; the building has been nice refined. He supported providing a letter regarding insulation.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if wayfinding to entrance is planned.

Mr. Aalfs said they wanted to undo the 1970's entrances. He said that with the change in massing between the two buildings people will recognize the entry.

Ed Weinstein noted the west is much more pronounced.

Mr. Coney noted the parking goes all the way through as well.

Ms. Sodt said to include a phrase in the motion to support energy code exemptions.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior and interior alterations, and support energy code exemptions, at the Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse, 2815 Elliott Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

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

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

Mr. Aalfs said he appreciated the good, collaborative process.

The following items were reviewed out of agenda order.

071917.6 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES

071917.61 American Meter & Appliance Building
1001 – 1005 Westlake Avenue North
Request for extension.

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a six-month extension. She said she had a productive meeting with the ownership and that they would be on ARC shortly.

Mr. Kiel asked if it was the same owners who removed the windows.

Ms. Sodt said yes. She again noted the meeting was productive. She said she was comfortable with the six-month extension.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the American Meter & Appliance Building, 1001 – 1005 Westlake Avenue North, for six months.

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

071917.4 DESIGNATION

071917.41

Pacific Architect & Builder
1945 Yale Place East

Andy Phillips and Tyler Sprague, Docomomo WeWa, presented the report (full report in DON file).

Mr. Phillips reported that Pacific Building publication was a product of the Modernist movement of the 1950s and 1960s; it promoted Modernism outside the Northwest. He said that A. O. Bumgardner designed the building; this was a pivot point for his career. He went from office and residential to larger scale projects after. He said Bumgardner was involved with AIA, Seattle Landmarks Board, and he was a consulting architect and the magazine and designer of this building.

Mr. Sprague provided handouts (in DON file) about thin shell concrete construction; through geometry and manipulation of thin sections, it can gain strength. He said the construction technique started in Europe – Germany, Spain – in the 1920s before coming to the US in the 1940's. Portland Cement was a modern material with low costs. Large volume spaces would be made with minimal material. He said the system was developed in the 1920s with domed / barrel vaulted shape. Load tests prove the system was very efficient and strong. He said that Anton Tedesko brought the technique and translated it to the American context; the Air Force built hangars without using steel. He said the single curvature was used here until the post WWII period when the hyperbolic paraboloid was developed. He said the double curvature was good for shells and allowed for different assemblies and shapes.

He said that Jack Christiansen and Anton Tedesko began to explore the use of thin shell technique in the Northwest; it was a repeatable, re-usable system. He said that it was the modular nature of his building that set him apart. He said Christiansen studied the work of Felix Candela in Mexico City. He said that Christiansen collaborated with Maury Proctor; they built a series of reusable forms which helped to cut construction costs and time. He said the Pacific Architect and Builder Building is an early collaboration between Christiansen and Proctor in the use of this construction form.

Mr. Sneddon noted the use with structural design of concrete dams.

Mr. Sprague said that the roots are in structural analysis, calculus and design came out of that. Candela really expanded upon that.

Mr. Sneddon noted the connection with development of high strength concrete, thin shelled and prestressed; he said both technologies were rising at the same time.

Mr. Sprague said the Northwest was a hotbed of concrete technology.

Ms. Johnson asked if any other areas of the country were using this technology.

Mr. Sprague said that Christiansen was pretty unique; no one else got the systematic formula down. He said this is where he first worked with Maury Proctor.

Mr. Phillips said it was noted in the structural drawings that they could build the traditional way or reuse the form so it could be bid either way.

Mr. Sprague said it was a way to make building economical. He said thin shells in the northwest were not flamboyant. He said Christiansen was good working with architects. He said thin shell eventually fell out of favor.

Mr. Coney noted Christiansen's impact on design and construction.

Mr. Sprague said design could be composed out of repeatable elements; architects could think creatively, spatially, and repetitively.

Mr. Coney asked if there is a Pacific Northwest variant.

Mr. Sprague said repetitive roof units. He said Christiansen worked with architects who were interested – Bassetti, Kirk – and they worked collaboratively.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, supported designation on criteria C, D, E and F. She thanked the building owners for their stewardship.

Molly Mahan, W. G. Clark Construction, said they bought the building in 2015. She said they are a local general contractor working in Puget Sound; they are now owned by a partner group, not the Clark family. She said they are in the process of getting ready to move into the subject building. She said they have a permit for tenant improvements; they will take out partitions that were installed in 2006. She said they will update the mechanical, add three windows in CMU wall on east side. She said it hadn't occurred to them that it would become a landmark; they plan to keep the building, but they do not support designation. She said the building is the work of an outstanding person but is not an outstanding piece of his work. She said this doesn't fit into his body of work and is not special. She said they have previously been in a 1923 building and have been able to change it to suit their needs over the years.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside thanked the presenters and commenters. He said there were other buildings with thin shelled elements; he mentioned the School District

Warehouse in the Cascade neighborhood which he said is now demolished. That building was his introduction to thin shell construction and he was taken aback by the presentation. He said that more of these buildings are lost than protected. He said these buildings need to be taken on their own merits and not compared to an 1880 building. He supported designation on C, D, and E.

Mr. Kiel asked about his thoughts related to the interior.

Mr. Ketcherside noted a building with distinctive roof form that had insulation put in which completely covered the form. He said the roofline could be visible through windows and the light aspect is important. He noted the importance of being able to take so much light in. He said viewing the internal structure is important.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported designation and said she echoed Mr. Ketcherside's comments. She said it encapsulates the hyperbolic paraboloids. She said it was an outstanding collaboration. She supported criteria D and E, and said F was questionable.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C, D, E and F. He said that C and E blend together. The building embodies distinct characteristics and how they experimented with form. He said it is a remarkable building that embodies a method of construction and an American adaptation of structural engineering. He said you can see how the method developed in Spain, Germany and Mexico and how it was adapted to America and how it contributed to Northwest Regionalism. He said the building was beginning to play with elements. He said it was a pathbreaking collaboration of architect and engineer. He noted the beauty and simplicity and said it is an excellent example of how this worked in the 1960's – many elements working together. He supported criteria C, D, E, and F.

Mr. Coney supported designation and said it is a distinctive building. He said it was built for Pacific Architect and Building. They made a statement with the building; it was well planned. He supported criteria C, D, and would consider F.

Ms. Patterson supported designation on criteria C, D, E and F. She said C is a stretch but the heritage is embodied in publication – the building was documented in the publication. She said the building doesn't stand out from a block away but once you are upon it, it is easily identified. She said it is hard to find thin shell that doesn't embody F, and said that all areas should be designated.

Ms. Johnson supported designation very strongly on criteria D and E and noted the economy and honesty of the materials. She said Criterion C is a hard sell and she questioned if it represents Northwest Modernism. She said it is a unique building and interior and she hoped preservation would make it useful for the long term.

Mr. Kiel supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. He said the building clearly embodies the style and method of construction. He noted Bumgardner, Dreyer, and Christiansen. He said to back away from nominating the interior, to make sure it can be reused and give flexibility to the owner.

Ms. Johnson agreed.

Mr. Sneddon said a false roof and / or ceiling would be dramatically impactful.

In response to a comment, Ms. Doherty said the roof/ceiling has spray foam on it now and they plan to reinsulate it with a similar product.

Molly said the previous tenants had temperature controls issues. She said the mechanical system comes through the peaked roof form and there are wall air conditioning units at either end.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about support for including interiors.

Ms. Johnson said she agreed with the intent of including them but wondered about the practicality.

Mr. Sneddon said the building was carefully designed to let light in.

There was overwhelming support for designation on Standards D and E.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Pacific Architect & Builder Building at 1945 Yale Place East as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the portion of the site described as Parcel A, the exterior of the building, and the roof/ceiling interior from the springpoint of the vaults upward.

MM/SC/MSN/RK 7:0:0 Motion carried.

071917.5 NOMINATION

071917.51 Shannon & Wilson Building
3652-3670 Woodland Park Avenue N / 1101-1111 N. 38th Street

Ms. Doherty said the building was nominated by an outside party; Landmarks staff has contacted the property owner and made them aware of the application. The owner said they do not want to participate in the process.

Susan Boyle, Docomomo WeWa, said they met with the owners to explain the process. She provided context of the site and neighborhood that was close to

transportation routes. She said that NBBJ started when Perry Johnson and others came together during the WWII; the 'team' approach was novel and the firm became a multi-disciplinary firm. She said they had unique structural designs and thin shell buildings. She said they advanced the prestressed, prefabricated concrete used at the Seattle World's Fair. She said the Seattle Style of Northwest Regionalism was concrete and more technically forward; it was utilitarian, not as expressive. She provided examples of thin shell buildings locally: Seattle School District Warehouse, West Coast Airline Hanger, Bainbridge Island Grandstand, Canlis, among others.

She said Shannon and Wilson provided engineering services and explored advanced thinking about architecture. She said the company newsletters were idealistic and socially advanced. She said they started company credit unions and employee benefits such as buying into the company, and supported diversity. She said they were innovators in civil engineering. She said that W. G. Clark Construction had a special interest in cast-in-place concrete. She noted the folded plate roof and clerestory windows and screen wall. She commented on the thinness and efficiency of the concrete and the materiality of a few components providing the most expression. She went through construction photos and said there were notes on the drawings about different methods of building formwork. She said the interior volume is simple and she noted the hovering quality of the roof plane; she noted systems furniture from the 1960's. She said the screen wall is a perforated and angled on cantilever; it blocks sun in a specific way.

She provided the current neighborhood context and said the entry on the west façade is different; it was originally a solid door and now has a storefront system. She said there is a new entry on the east side which allowed multiple tenant use; the screen wall was opened up. She noted the luminosity and light in the building and it was a sort of beacon in evenings and winter. She noted the idealism of the period, ingenuity, and the beaconlike quality of the building. She said the building meets criteria C, D, and E.

Tyler Sprague, Docomomo WeWA, said this building had the same structural engineer as the Pacific Architect & Builder. He said it is different in the way the shells cantilever from the building. He said it is expressive, strong structural form. He noted the ingenuity and expressive qualities as well as the technical and engineering capabilities.

Mr. Coney asked about Shannon & Wilson's slope indicator; he said this was one of the top geotechnical firms.

Ms. Boyle said the XY Company connected to Japan; the engineering company was looking at soil / seismic issues.

Mr. Kiel asked if they traveled to earthquake sites to study. He asked how they became cutting edge in geo-technology.

Ms. Patterson recused herself from the deliberation.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked if they designed the building for a specific use.

Ms. Boyle said no. She said the design that emerged came from a client that wanted an open, well-lit space; the design probably evolved.

Mr. Kiel said the screening is prominent – almost turning its back on the neighborhood; he asked what drove that.

Ms. Boyle said they wanted light; there were spandrel panels and windows behind.

Andy Phillips noted the building is engaging at a pedestrian level.

Ms. Johnson asked if the garden area was used.

Ms. Boyle said it was in a company brochures and it appears to have been there; she hasn't looked into the screen wall playing off a Japanese garden.

Mr. Ketcherside said that it is if playing off Japanese design the norm would be to have a wall.

Mr. Sprague said there is a slight cant to the blocks that echoes the roof elements.

Ms. Johnson noted the screen is elevated off the ground on a cantilevered shelf.

Ms. Boyle said she was drawn in by the architectural form and then became aware of the history of Shannon & Wilson.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle / Docomomo WeWa, thanked Ms. Boyle for her report. She supported nomination on criteria C, D, and E. She said that Shannon and Wilson collaborated with architects, engineers, and designers and shaped the built environment in the City. She said she loves the screen wall.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Johnson supported nomination on criteria D and E; regarding Criterion C she wanted to hear more from other board members. She said the building is unique in the neighborhood and fits into the small-scale neighborhood.

Mr. Ketcherside asked who B was for.

Ms. Doherty said she noted it for Shannon & Wilson; they were remarkable regionally and maybe nationally.

Mr. Coney said they may be nationally significant for the slope indicator; they have many patents. He said the building was designed and built specifically for them, and their work is connected to their occupancy in this building. He said there is probably a significant foundation because of their equipment. He supported nomination on D and E and maybe C.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination on D and E and said it is similar to the other building presented earlier. He said that Shannon and Wilson was important regionally.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported nomination on criteria D and E; she said she wanted more information on B and C. What kind of influence did Shannon & Wilson have nationally?

Mr. Ketcherside said he wanted more information on criteria B and C and how Shannon and Wilson contributed. He said that NBBJ's own office building was not designated and was demolished; buildings that are not designated are demolished. He said suggested a thematic district for mid-century offices of design/engineering professionals, and noted that the Pacific Architect and Builder building and this one would be lynchpins.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination and noted the impact Shannon and Wilson had. He noted the life safety component that is underappreciated. He said the technology they invented earned them national attention and new projects.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Shannon & Wilson Office Building at 3652-3670 Woodland Park Avenue N / 1101-1111 North 38th Street for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site and the exterior of the building; roof ceiling form from spring point of vaults upward; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for September 6, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RK/EV 6:0:1 Motion carried. (Ms. Patterson recused herself).

071917.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator