



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 184 /16

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor
Room L2-80 Boards & Commissions
Wednesday, March 16, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson
Deb Barker
Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Chair
Julianne Patterson
Mike Stanley

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Nick Carter
Kathleen Durham
Matthew Sneddon

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

031616.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 16, 2015

MM/SC/DB/JM

8:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Stanley abstained.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

January 6, 2016
MM/SC/RK/JK

7:0:2 Minutes approved. Messrs. Murdock and Stanley
abstained.

031616.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

031616.21 Columbia City Landmark District
3810 S. Ferdinand St.

Proposed installation of a 2-sided blade sign and window signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a double-faced blade sign and vinyl decal window signage. Exhibits included photographs, renderings and samples. The building is a non-contributing building located outside of the Columbia City National Register District. On March 1, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee recommended approval of the proposal, as proposed.

Katie Rob, Columbia City Veterinary Clinic, said the sign and vinyl window decals will have a similar feel to existing signs and will have their brand.

Ms. Barker asked the number of bolts that will be used to hang the sign.

Ms. Rob said they will use one set. The existing stanchion will be used.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said it is quaint and reasonable with cute graphics.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs located at 3810 S. Ferdinand St. 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:

Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:

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.

b. 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.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards #10

MM/SC/DB/JM 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031616.22

Columbia City Landmark District
4739 ½ Rainier Ave. S. – Hasegawa Professional Building
Proposed window signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed vinyl decal window signage. Exhibits included photographs, renderings and samples. She reported that the Hasegawa Building is a non-contributing building located within the Columbia City National Register District. The Committee received a briefing on proposed sign options in January 2016. On March 1, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee recommended approval of the proposal, as proposed.

Scott Shillito, presenting on behalf of the owners of Well-Dressed Window, said that Ms. Frestedt’s staff report covered it. He had nothing to add.

There were no board questions.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker thought it was appropriate.

Mr. Luoma said the scale and colors seem reasonable for building.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage located at 4739 ½ Rainier Ave. S. 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:

Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:

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 Interiors Standards #10

MM/SC/RK/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031616.23

Columbia City Landmark District
3515 S. Alaska Street – Rainier Valley Cultural Center
Proposed installation of two (2) banners

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of two (2) banners, reflecting the new name for the building, “Rainier Arts Center”, intended to be hung while permanent signage is planned. Attachment will not penetrate the building. Exhibits included photographs and renderings. She reported that the Rainier Valley Cultural Center (historically: Fifth Church of Christ, Scientist) was constructed in 1921. It is a contributing building located within the Columbia City National Register District. Banners are typically considered temporary signage; however, the duration to display temporary signs, as defined by the land use code, is 54 days. The applicants are asking for a longer duration while the design and approval for permanent signage is under review. On March 1, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Committee members discussed the orientation and attachment for the proposed short-term signs. They also received a briefing on alternative plans for long-term or permanent signage and provided feedback to the applicants. Committee members agreed that the banner proposal would be acceptable, conditional on establishing a time-limit for removal. Members agreed that 6 months was reasonable. Following their deliberations, the Committee recommended approval of the proposal for a period not to exceed 6 months.

Kathy Fowells, SEEDArts, said that the name of the Rainier Valley Cultural Center is changing to Rainier Arts Center. They want to update the name in time for the release of the 2016 events calendar. She said the proposed banners are temporary. She

explained that they will remove letters on the east façade as part of larger plan for replacement signage.

Mr. Luoma asked if CCRC is confident the applicant is moving ahead with getting funding for the final signage.

Ms. Frestedt said yes.

Ms. Barker asked if the material for the front door banner is vinyl and if it has slats for wind.

Ms. Fowells said there are air flow holes in the sides; it was designed by a professional banner company. She said black bungees will hold the banner up and will go around pillars so they won't drill into pillars.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said that they captured the issues and said it is acceptable to keep the banner up six months.

Mr. Luoma noted the staff comment that the local review committee has already seen proposal for future signage so clearly it is in process.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the installation of two (2) banner signs, located at 3515 S. Alaska Street, to be hung for a duration not to exceed 6 months, while a plan for permanent signage is reviewed and approved.

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:

**Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:
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 Interiors Standards #2, #9 and #10

MM/SC/JM/JP 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031616.24

Alki Homestead / Fir Lodge

2717 61st Avenue SW

Proposed rehabilitation and site improvements

Ms. Doherty provided background on the building and noted items that have received administrative approval.

Jeffrey Hamlett explained the plan to restore the Homestead and went over site plan. He said they will remove the bar addition and use the space for parking and accessible entry ramp. He said that the kitchen addition will be removed and a new kitchen rebuilt on same foundation. He said that garbage enclosure will be located on site. He said on the ground floor they will remove the raised floor so it will all be one level. He said that they have removed old stones from the fireplace that were a later addition; underneath the fireplace fell apart and they will restore it to what it looked like when an originally a residence. He said they will keep the stairs; but there will be a wall at the top. He said they will make the patio bigger and add an exterior stair at the back to serve the second floor apartments; the existing steel stair will be replaced with wood.

Mr. Hamlett said that on the second floor three studio units are accessed from one stair off the back. He noted the high ceiling and said that an emergency egress window will be created for each unit. He said they will cut a slot in the head of window framing so they can raise the sash high enough for a code compliant opening. He said that new joist will be installed and they will raise floor to insulate for sound and run fire sprinklers. He said that at the main entrance they will infill fireplace chimney to stiffen it up for seismic purposes. He said they will remove the chimney from central fireplace and rebuild the exterior portion clad with river rock, and will use it for venting range hoods. He said they will add four skylights to the top and noted that they are not visible unless you are across the street and above.

He said that at the former bar location they will infill the wall and put wood shingles on it. They will replace the back door. They will replace the window on the north side of existing door – it will match original door on south side and will have true divided lights. He said that the fence on the back side alley is designed to look like window mullions.

Mr. Hamlett said that they have to brace the building seismically and will create steel moment frames; he showed where they will be installed around the perimeter of the dining space. He said they won't cover windows or existing openings. He said they will be painted brown or gray to blend in. He said the new footings will be concrete.

He said that they have to remove a lot of the existing fir wood floor and will replace it all in-kind. He said that they will re-roof using similar material to what is there now but it will be a darker brown. He said that kitchen cladding will be wood tongue and groove siding. He said that they will use brown flashing, downspouts and gutters to blend.

Ms. Doherty said the architectural language of the kitchen addition was worked out through briefings with ARC; the applicant was asked to draw from the existing architectural vocabulary of the log house.

Mr. Stanley asked about the stair off the back.

Mr. Hamlett noted sheet A3.1 and said they will use a precast stair tread; 4" x 14" wood stringer, 2" x 2" wood rails, and 2" x 3" verticals with 1" x 2" attached. He said the landing will be concrete and will be lower than what is there now.

Ms. Barker asked if the new doors and windows will have insulated glass.

Mr. Murdock said that just one window on the back door is replaced.

Mr. Hamlett said that there will be all new exterior wood doors – hollow metal frame around door at kitchen access.

Ms. Patterson asked about the height of the skylights.

Mr. Hamlett said they are 12" tall at most and the frame will be black.

Responding to questions Mr. Hamlet said that they are using spray foam at the interior and they won't have to vent the roof.

Ms. Patterson said that in the Preservation Briefs spray foam is not recommended for historic building because it is not easily removed and it hides source of water infiltration issues.

Mr. Hamlett said that the foam is being used at the upper floor which is not designated; he said they are putting in sprinklers.

Ms. Doherty said she believes they need full sprinklers because of occupancy separation issues. She said that other solutions would cover the wood ceiling in the dining area or create a heavy overlay on the floor above (a structural issue). She said she will review the sprinkler drawings administratively for the designated areas, and she believes the owner intends to use concealed heads.

Public Comment:

Clay Eals, Southwest Seattle Historical Society, said he fully supported the work and that he is impressed with the creativity. He said what is proposed is sensitive to the details and they are going the extra mile. He noted the integrity of work already done to date.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said that ARC questions have been answered.

Mr. Ketcherside said he looked forward to the building going back to its previous use as a restaurant.

Mr. Stanley asked if river rock would go back in at the fireplace.

Mr. Hamlet said that they are strengthening the fireplace and then the river rock will go back.

Ms. Doherty said that it looks like it had been altered from original chimney and the existing height looks similar.

Mr. Murdock said the applicant was responsive to ARC comments.

Ms. Barker said it has been challenging from the start – it was old then had a fire and then it sat for a long time. She said the applicant has been receptive and responsive to ARC.

Mr. Luoma said the materials to be used on the new kitchen are complementary to the old portion.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the site improvements, and exterior and interior rehabilitation at the Fir Lodge / Alki Homestead, 2717 61st Avenue SW, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed site improvements, and exterior and interior rehabilitation do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 118235 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/DB/RK 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031616.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

031616.31 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Request for an extension

Ms. Doherty read letter from owner requesting a three month extension for Controls and Incentives. She said it has been the same increment for all their recent requests. She said they are hoping to brief the full board at the April 6th meeting to show a current proposal for the property. She said in the past they have shown townhomes and the board has provided feedback on placement, bulk and scale and the possible demolition of the office

and lodge buildings. She said the board asked them to investigate alternatives to adaptive reuse. She said they want to look at adaptive reuse for the whole site with some potential infill, as an institutional use not residential. She said the briefing will be to the full board rather than ARC because of the scale and complexity of the property.

Public Comment:

Colleen McAleer, Laurelhurst Community Club, asked what the ARC is.

Ms. Doherty said it is the Architectural Review Committee.

Ms. Barker said she was excited to see the potential use.

Mr. Luoma indicated there was some impatience but now noted a possible tenant and keeping all structures on the site.

Mr. Murdock said a briefing is encouraging.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center, 4000 NE 41st Street, for three months.

MM/SC/JM/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031616.32 Wayne Apartments
2224 2nd Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a two month extension. She said she met with the owner several times and they have provided requested information for possible options for rehabilitation.

Ms. Patterson asked what would happen if the board didn't approve.

Ms. Sodt said they try not to get to that point.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Luoma said it is reasonable.

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

MM/SC/RK/JK 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031616.33 Maritime Building
911 Western Avenue
Request for an extension

Ms. Sodt explained that the owners have provided briefings to ARC. She said they requested a four month extension. She said they plan to get preliminary approval for addition to the building and noted that SEPA will be required. She said they have reduced the proposed addition to two stories with a third floor set back; originally they

proposed an 8-story addition. Responding to questions she said that there is a 50' setback requirement for view corridors but the code allows an intrusion if it is a landmark. She said they have tentative agreement with SDCI.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Luoma said it is reasonable especially since they just came to ARC.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Maritime Building, 911 Western Avenue, for four months.

MM/SC/JM/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

031616.4 DESIGNATION

031616.41 Bryant's Marina / UW Police Facilities
1109-1117 NE Boat Street

Susan Boyle, BOLA, presented the report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and said that the former mill and box factory was acquired by the Department of Parks and Recreation (DOPAR). She said that at the nomination meeting board members had questions about lumber mill buildings and her presentation would be in response. She said this site is a multi-building assembly which is typical of mills. She noted the many machines used at mills and the various functions housed in the different buildings: cutting, debarking, drying sheds, sawing, and conical burners. She explained that mills were sited near water for ease of transportation – she provided historic photo of logs floating in the water. She said that buildings were moved, added to and torn down in accommodation of needs at the time.

She provided current context of the buildings that are now UW academic buildings; she said they are not easily seen except from across Portage Bay or from the University Bridge. She noted the large shed, remnants of dock structures, former Timmerman marina, and garage structure. She said that later addition of roman brick to the primary façades of buildings B and C unified the structures but the back / water side is still a hodge podge with sawtooth roof monitors, gable and Timmerman buildings evident. She said that interior of the open shed building has a heavy timber frame; most of the building is on a heavy platform over the water. She said that upstairs you can see remnants of skylights. She noted multiple types of trusses that are representative of buildings of this type. She said the open volume allows much storage space.

Ms. Boyle said she didn't think the buildings met any of the standards for designation. She said there is no association with a significant event or person. She said that it is a working set of buildings with many layers. She said it is a remnant only and not a mill structure. She said it was haphazardly constructed and although representative of early lumber mills she questioned if changes to make it work as a marina were too much. She said that the buildings are disguised and not visible except from a distance and she questioned whether the contrast in age with surrounding buildings gives it any specific identity to the neighborhood.

Board Questions:

Mr. Luoma said on the tour he noticed a different pitch on the roof; he asked why on the north side it is not symmetrical.

Ms. Boyle said it is conjectural. She said looking at trusses it may have been added to or expanded.

Mr. Murdock asked if there are other mill examples in the City.

Ms. Boyle said not that she knows. She noted that a two story in Fremont was moved. She said there are mills out in the hinterlands.

Mr. Murdock asked about related to the ship canal.

Ms. Boyle said she remembered log booms from Lake Sammamish and the Sammamish Slough – there was a burner there – now gone.

Mr. Ketcherside said there was one at the Montlake cut.

Ms. Boyle noted Denny Mill was at South Lake Union.

Mr. Stanley asked if it was only Building D, would the analysis change.

Ms. Boyle said that the whole property was presented and she explored looking at its associations. She said that it is only a remnant of a lumber mill and while it is representative of a heavy timber structure she questioned if that means it's distinctive.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Stanley did not support designation and while the form is pleasing from the water there is a lack of integrity.

Ms. Patterson said that Building D was eligible as representative of the maritime heritage and history of milling on the waterfront. She said she would support Criterion F but her strongest support was for D. She said it stands out from the water and a street view isn't needed; the building was meant to be seen from the water. She noted the evolution of the building – the roof framing of Building D and the combination of king post and clerestory. She said the building is distinctive and represents its history. She supported designation on criteria C, D and F.

Mr. Murdock supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He said that lumber is so significant an industry in our region. He said the buildings convey that significance. He said it is regional in scale but right in the center of the city. He said it meets the 'double significance' element. Building D spans open trusses and flexibility meets criterion D. He said the trusses seem of their period and he didn't think they had been changed. He said that the buildings do contrast with what is now around them and are easily identifiable. He said he could imagine the equipment and manufacturing occurring in the buildings.

Mr. Kiel wasn't convinced and said if swayed it would be on criterion F. He did not see the significance of its connection to recreational boating.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support designation but he was glad it was considered. He said it is compelling but there is not enough integrity as a mill structure. He questioned if it was the last lumber related structure in the city. He said that if the building next to it was removed it would reveal a lack of symmetry.

Ms. Durham said she missed the nomination meeting and was relying on other board members. She noted the confusion of everything on the site. She said Building D would be the only one she would consider. She said it might be the last mill building in the area but if you remove everything else she didn't think it could convey that.

Ms. Barker commended Ms. Boyle for her research on the hodge podge of buildings. She said she leaned toward supporting designation because there are still remnants that are connected to the mill history. She said she can see it has prominence and tell its story. She supported designation of Building D on criteria C, D, and maybe F.

Ms. Anderson said it is a challenging property. She said the heavy timber of Building D tells the story of timber industry and changes over time. She said the movement of buildings over the site is difficult to convey. She said that Building D is the only one that has a way to convey the industry.

Mr. Luoma supported designation and said Building D stood out. He said it is difficult to piece together the history, whether and how far moved, and any alterations. He said as seen now it is difficult to see how it could have been moved. He questioned if this is the last remaining significant remnant of the maritime and logging and milling history. He said he would lean toward caution and said it is valuable enough and worthy of preservation on criteria C, D and F. He said there isn't enough proof to say that it isn't. He said a lumber mill is like a campus – it is made up of more than one building. He noted the timber-framed Building D and the proximity to water indicates a close relationship to water dependent industry.

Mr. Kiel noted the different experience of other board members on the tour and said Mr. Luoma's comments may have convinced him to support designation.

Mr. Ketcherside said there is a lot of stuff just there but it doesn't convey anything to him. He said it is not clear what happens when you separate a building from the others.

Mr. Kiel noted the changes to the buildings over time but that he said it is a landmark from the water's edge.

Mr. Luoma said that the integrity is questionable but that it has the ability to convey its significance.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of Bryant's Marina / Puget Sound Lumber Company at 1109-1117 NE Boat Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site, the exterior of Building D and its interior structural frame.

MM/SC/JM/JP

5:4:0 Motion failed. Mmes. Johnson and Anderson and Messrs. Ketcherside and Stanley opposed.

031616.5 NOMINATION

031616.51 Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Exchange
1529 4th Avenue West

Dennis Reddinger presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He said the Library is clarifying status of building in preparation for a future sale. He said they use it for storage and they prefer that it not be landmarked. He said the building was built in the 1920s as an exchange; an earlier exchange building is up the street. He said there are many in the city and they were operated by switchboard operators. He said there were multiple companies – all competing; eventually they all became Qwest.

Susan Boyle provided context of the site and neighborhood. She said it is a residential neighborhood and the Queen Anne Library is across the street. She noted the interesting history of the telephone and switchboard operators. She said that switchboard operators were women and noted the significance in labor history. She said the new phone provided access to young people.

She said that the building was designed to fit into the neighborhood. It is brick, classical style, rectilinear in form and with a cornice band; it has a raised basement and decorative surround. It is L-shaped with opportunity for courtyard. She said there are other like buildings in the city. She said that the building was built in 1921; in 1925 they added a floor and used the same brick and windows. She said the Library acquired the building and in 1977 added an exterior stair. She said the women's lounge is not open space but otherwise it is still as it was built.

Ms. Boyle said that there are setbacks on two sides; it is C-shaped with a small internal courtyard. She said that the building is intact except for cornice band that was removed. She said the large wood frame windows are there although some glazing has been replaced some with wire glass. She said that there are large metal roll up fire shutters. She said the main entry is simple metal flush panel entry system with terracotta surround. She noted the open staircases with mahogany balustrades, and marble. She noted the restroom marble and glazed hexlites, the soldering niches, and masonry fireplace.

She said that the building does not meet criteria A or B. She said the building is one of a number from the 1920s – six that she knows of. She said the building can't tell the story of the rise of telecom technology and switchboards. She said it is a simple industrial commercial building. She said the building is representative and not distinctive and did not meet criterion D. She said the original architect is unknown, and Arthur D. Codington designed the 1929 addition; the building design is standard and does not meet Criterion E. She said that the building is a companion to the library; it is brick clad and historicist in design details. She said it is set in a residential area. She questioned if it contrasted with its neighbors, and noted the library is a landmark.

Mr. Murdock asked about buildings that are utilitarian but located in residential neighborhoods and near libraries.

Ms. Boyle said that libraries and these types of service buildings were frequently located in residential areas. She said the one on Rainier Avenue is a dozen blocks from the library, and the one in Wallingford isn't near the library. She said there is no formal connection she just commented about this one instance.

Mr. Murdock said in a rapidly growing industry it had to be expandable and left a bit open-ended. He said this one seems symmetrical.

Ms. Boyle said that here they added a floor.

Mr. Murdock noted the quality of the brick façade and asked if it was intentional that they were able to add the floor seamlessly.

Ms. Boyle said in the 1921 Pacific Telecom magazine in Los Angeles the building was stucco clad. In Seattle it showed as single story with projecting cornice and she didn't know the intention.

Ms. Johnson asked if the original structure was overdesigned to allow for the added floor and heavy equipment.

Ms. Boyle said she didn't know, and that maybe it was for fire resistance.

Mr. Reddinger said it spread out the weight on the floor.

Mr. Luoma said it is an interesting adaptive reuse for storage – it was designed to hold heavy equipment. He asked if expansion upward was easier than going out.

Ms. Boyle said that later buildings are taller. She said it may be a function of equipment of a lighter weight.

Ms. Barker said she was intrigued by the picture of the interior with the switchboard and asked why there was a radiator in the middle of the room.

Ms. Boyle said that image was of a different building.

Mr. Luoma asked if the site was selected for a specific reason, or if it was just available.

Ms. Boyle said it was a vacant site – hasn't seen service map – the earlier exchange building still exists nearby.

Mr. Murdock said the soldering niches were interesting and asked if there were gas lines.

Ms. Boyle said she didn't check.

Mr. Reddinger said it was just a small niche.

Mr. Murdock asked if there was a gas line in the lobby.

Ms. Boyles said she was not sure what it is.

Ms. Patterson asked if the niches are present in other exchanges.

Ms. Boyle said probably.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Anderson supported nomination so she could think about it more. She said the building can convey its history and story. She thought about other similar buildings and the relationship to the neighborhood and how it has remained in this state.

Ms. Barker supported nomination including the site, interior and exterior. She said that being similar to other exchanges doesn't eliminate it from landmark status. She said the cornice removal is a shame. She commended the original company designer on the great terracotta features.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination and noted it being a commercial building in a residential neighborhood. She said she would like to see other buildings like this. She said it was meant to fit in a residential neighborhood. She said it is interesting that it was adjacent to the library. She said that she is not sold but interested. She said the integrity is good and she wanted to know more.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and said he would like a tour. He said he wanted to know more about the building, about the phone exchange which he noted existed in every neighborhood. He said he wants to see the soldering nooks.

Mr. Kiel said he wanted to hear more input on C, D, E, and F. He noted the comment letter that the neighborhood feels it is a landmark. He supported nomination to have a tour and give it more thought.

Mr. Murdock said it meets the social and economic and architectural criteria. He noted the flexibility and expandability of the building and said it must be able to convey its importance in the telecom industry. He noted the flexibility of use. He noted the relationship to women in industry, women as workers, in management. He was interested in the soldering stations.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination and said the discussion around the previously reviewed building was that it had integrity issues that made it hard to decipher its use and purpose and this one is unchanged yet it doesn't physically illustrate its original use. She wondered if when you walked inside you would know what it was. She wants to see the niches.

Mr. Stanley said the building was intended to disappear into the background of the neighborhood. He supported nomination.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination. He said he lived nearby and is familiar with the building. He said early he didn't know what it was and thought it was an apartment building. He wanted to know more information on its location and why it was chosen. He said the building stands out and is important in its own community. He was also interested in the soldering niches.

Mr. Ketcherside said several board members mentioned the soldering niches.

Ms. Barker said she wanted a tour to see the building interior.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Exchange at 1529 4th Avenue West 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 interior, and the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 20, 2016; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/DB/JM 9:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Doherty noted that the exterior niche originally housed a telephone; noted in the architectural drawings.

031616.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator