



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 419/15

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, July 15, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Robert Ketcherside  
Aaron Luoma  
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair  
Sarah Shadid  
Matthew Sneddon  
Elaine Wine

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Genna Nashem  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Mike Stanley  
Alison Walker Brems  
Nick Carter

Vice Chair Jeffrey Murdock called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

#### **071515.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

June 17, 2015

MM/SC/DB/AL 5:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Shadid abstained.

#### **071515.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

071515.21 Harvard Belmont Landmark District  
1137 Harvard Ave E

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Demolition of chimney after the fact; and proposed rebuilding of existing chimney and removal and infill of two windows

Carrie Anderson apologized for the removal of the chimney and said she wasn't aware of the board review requirement. She said the owner shouldn't have to bear the financial burden of the city's application service center mistake; she said it is a significant cost. She said that the owner purchased the property in 2014 and is currently living in New York. She said they plan to preserve the exterior and make changes to the interior such as create a great room concept but the chimney was right in the middle. She said they also want to capture more space in the attic bonus room. She said the installation of new kitchen cabinetry will require removal of windows on the north wall of the kitchen. She added that they could retain the windows and cover them from the interior.

Wil Zogbaum, Schuchart Dow, explained what the process to replace the removed chimney would be and said rebuilding the chimney just from the roof up would require structural support. They provided a cost analysis handout.

Ms. Wine said it seems extensive.

Mr. Luoma asked if they considered re-organizing the cabinetry to retain the windows and gain light into the space.

Ms. Anderson said that they had but noted impacts to the new dining and catering space.

Ms. Barker asked if they had ever worked on historic property.

Ms. Anderson said she had not.

Responding to questions Ms. Nashem explained the district was created in 1980. She explained she had not experienced this situation before where DPD gave a permit without Certificate of Approval. She said that typically DPD will refer an applicant to DON or applicant will contact her before even applying to DPD.

Mr. Murdock said it shouldn't lessen the bar.

Ms. Nashem said the committee recommended keeping the windows in place, covering them from the interior instead of infill and recommended rebuilding the chimney.

Ms. Sodt said the application could be tabled due to lack of information on chimney and window infill alternatives. She said it would be helpful for the local committee to see the cost and repercussions of structural issues presented today.

Ms. Anderson said she would table the application to present the information to the local review committee.

Discussion ensued about the architectural value of the chimney; its reflection of the historical period and architectural style. They were hesitant about economic hardship appeals in light of other improvements being made. Board members agreed to table the application pending further information.

Action: I move to table the application for 1137 Harvard Ave. E. pending further information.

MM/SC/EW/SSH 6:0:0 Motion carried.

071515.22

Fort Lawton Landmark District

4200 – 4218 Washington Ave W and 400 – 4012 Washington Ave W  
Amendment to LPB20815 to relocate garages and change drainage

Ms. Nashem explained the amendment to previously approved alterations (LPB # 317/11 and LPB#208/15), including relocation of proposed garages back approximately 15 feet from previously approved location, one garage to be reduced in size to accommodate new location and changes to the drainage to include rock basins.

P. J. Barkley explained that the new owner prefers to relocate the garages to retain the existing power poles. He went over lot coverage and pervious surfaces, DPD rear ad side yard nomenclature, and proposed drainage plans. He said that the garages will be moved back a few feet and the side yard setbacks will be 1'9" smaller in depth. He said that the garages retain the orientation to the dwellings and the view corridors to dwelling.

Responding to questions Susan Boyle explained that the power lines are behind the houses; putting the lines underground was too expensive.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said the application was reasonable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed changes to amend previously approved garages in LPB # 317/11 and LPB# 208/15.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Fort Lawton District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed restorations plans as presented April 1, 2015 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the buildings as specified in Ordinance #122750.

The other factors of SMC25.12.750 are not applicable

The Fort Lawton District Guidelines

Zone 3: WASHINGTON AVENUE (OFFICERS' ROW)

*Additions/Enlargements and New Construction*

Additional garage/storage buildings are allowed directly behind existing residences, in the same style and proportion as existing garage buildings and of the same materials and as approved by the Landmarks Preservation Board, Certificate of Approval LPB # 317/11 which allows the demolition of garages No.

S-641, S-645, S-671, S-673 and S-677.

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

071515.23

Columbia City Landmark District

3714 S. Hudson St. – Esmay Building

Proposed signage, exterior and site alterations.

Ms. Frestedt said the work is a continuation of work seen previously by the Board. She explained the proposal to add two (2) painted wall signs (dimensions: 20'3"w x 3'9"h), construction of an outdoor patio and seating area, installation of a bio-diesel storage tank and new garbage enclosure. Exhibits included plans, renderings and cut sheets. She reported that the Esmay Building is a one-story commercial/garage building constructed in 1947. It is a non-contributing building within the district. The Landmark Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations and the construction of a small addition on the rear of the building in May 2015. She said, the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application on July 7, 2015 and recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Roz Edison, one of the business owners, summarized the proposal. She explained that a bio-diesel tank will be installed to allow for the collection of fry oil; dumpsters will be relocated to the far corner of the parking lot to allow spacing for the patio. An outdoor patio will be created. She said that the name 'Super Six' relates to the building's former auto related use and noted that it's their sixth business venture. Signage will have red wings similar to Super Six car logo.

Ms. Barker asked where the oil container will go.

Ms. Edison said that it will be in alley and is no deeper than gas meeting. She said that the food truck will park there only at night.

Ms. Barker asked about garbage and recycling.

Ms. Edison said that the enclosure will be a basic chain link with black slats to match the color theme of the building.

Ms. Wine, who had attended the Review Committee meeting, said the CCRC was supportive. She noted the size of the proposed sign and the fact that it's larger than what is commonly seen in the District; however, she said there was historic precedent for painting on building as well as the connection to this building historically. She said it is good activation of the space.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Shadid said she liked the signage and noted the font is similar to the original Esmay font. She said the seating area is great. She supported the CCRC's recommendation.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage, exterior alterations and site alterations, located at 3714 S. Hudson St. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations and signage meet the following sections of the District ordinance and the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

**Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:**

**2. Building Materials and Fixtures.** Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

**3. Building Surface Treatments.** Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an

"historic colors" palette that may be useful as a guide. The Board Coordinator also has a palette of historic colors that may be used as reference.

**9. Parking.** To mitigate the potential impacts of required accessory parking and loading on the District, the Review Committee and Board may review parking requirements for individual building rehabilitation projects or changes of use in existing buildings. The Board may write a letter of support to the Department of Planning and Development Director for a reduction in required parking or loading for a specific building rehabilitation project, new construction, or change of use in an existing building if the Review Committee and Board find that reasonable application of the parking or loading standards will adversely affect the character of the District or will not further District goals.

**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.

### **Secretary of the Interior Standards #9 & 10**

MM/SC/DB/SSH 6:0:0 Motion carried.

071515.24

#### Columbia City Landmark District

4901 Rainier Ave. S. – Hastings Building

Proposed awning demolition, construction of a temporary wall and Phase I of structural improvements.

Proposal for Phase I of building restoration, consisting of removing the canopy, repairing penetrations that resulted from the canopy attachment, installation of wall-ties and rosettes. (5 11/16" in diameter) and construction of a temporary plywood wall painted to match the building exterior. Work associated with Phase II will follow under a separate application. Exhibits included photographs, plans and letter from a structural engineer. The Hudson Building was constructed in 1905. It is an historic non-contributing building within the district. Ms. Frestedt noted that the original storefronts have been

significantly altered from their original design. The one-story masonry building is clad in stucco. The canopy was added in 1938 and the storefronts were renovated in 1958. She said the building was significantly damaged as a result of impact from a car in August 2014.

Ms. Frestedt said that on May 5, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee received a project briefing, which included a discussion about the proposal to remove the canopy to help facilitate interior repairs. The Committee members acknowledged the age of the canopy, but did not think that it had gained significance in the District. During public comment, a community member stated that the canopy “detracted” from the district’s character. Following the discussion, committee members stated that they did not object to the proposed canopy removal and were supportive of the conceptual direction of the proposed restoration.

Ms. Frestedt stated that on July 7, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee discussed the scope of work and canopy removal. Members again acknowledged the canopy’s distinct art deco design and noted it was not original to the building. There was further discussion about the rationale for removal and members offered preliminary guidance about a proposal to construct a new canopy. Following discussion, members of the CCRC recommended approval and requested additional clarifying documentation.

#### Applicant Comment:

Guy Davis presented photos of the building and summarized damage created by impact from a car. He reported that their structural engineer – Swenson Say Faget – determined that the canopy is not structurally sound and recommended removal. Removal is also necessary to access the interior to make the necessary structural improvements. He said the proposal includes demolition of the awning and construction of a temporary plywood wall over the window and transom until Phase 2 is done. He went through construction details and said there will be no harm to historic integrity of the building. He said they will paint the temporary wall the current building color. He said the building owner will maintain the temporary storefront and manage graffiti removal.

Mr Davis provided a brief overview of phase II of the project (not included in this proposal), which will include additional columns and support; restoration of window and historic transom windows; potential addition of two commercial tenant facades; and add two openings in the back.

Ms. Wine said that CCRC reviewed the proposed awning removal and discussed whether or not the awning had gained historic significance – noting the unusual, art deco design. She the CCRC deferred to the feedback from the initial briefing; members supported its removal and focused on the structural

engineer report. She said the original building couldn't support it and would require so much reinforcement it seems disingenuous to reconstruct it. She said it didn't seem worth preserving the canopy at the expense of the building's integrity. She said the Committee supported Phase I. She said putting the wall up with no windows is not economically viable and the owner has every incentive to complete the work.

Public Comment:

Rob Mohn, community member and property owner, said this building is at a main intersection. He said the car accident was a year ago. He asked the Board to consider the adverse impact of not allowing the awning removal to occur.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma noted structural issues and said the building is non-contributing and noted that so much had changed. He said the proposal was reasonable.

Ms. Shadid supported the application.

Mr. Sneddon said it would be different if the building were contributing; he said it will have minimal impact on the district.

Mr. Murdock noted the microfilm photos that shows a different awning on the building. He said he supports the use of the microfilm as inspiration for the design in phase II.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations associated with phase I of the building restoration, located at 4901 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

**Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:**

**2. Building Materials and Fixtures.** Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.



**3. Building Surface Treatments.** Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an "historic colors" palette that may be useful as a guide. The Board Coordinator also has a palette of historic colors that may be used as reference.

### **Secretary of the Interior Standards**

**#2.** The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

**#4.** Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

**#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.

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

MM/SC/EW/SSH 6:0:0 Motion carried.

071515.25 Pacific Medical Center / former U.S. Marine Hospital  
1200 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue South  
Proposed lobby improvements and art installation

Michele Hasson explained the ‘men who worked on ships’ murals, by artist Kenneth Callahan, that had originally been installed in the rooms on either side of the lobby. She noted that they received a grant to return 7 of 11 murals to Pacific Tower, and to install them in nearly the same precise locations. She said that they will do restoration and installation of the murals and some modest renovations to the two reception rooms. She said they were originally not framed and Artech has recommended framing them to provide a little protection. She explained where new carpet will go – in area without the terrazzo. She said that they will put a chair rail – like what is in east room - in the west room. She showed paint scheme, very similar to current.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said that ARC thought it was all reasonable and recommended approval.

Mr. Murdock agreed and said it is exciting the murals are coming back to the building; they tell the story of the building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interior alterations at the Pacific Medical Tower, 1200 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed lobby improvements and art installation do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 116055, 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/DB/AL 6:0:0 Motion carried.

071515.26 Fir Lodge / Alki Homestead  
2717 61<sup>st</sup> Avenue SW  
Proposed interior alterations

Matt Schilling explained proposed alterations and restoration of the fireplace; he said they will take off the large overlaid stones. He said they will replace the approximate 6" x 12" timber mantle and fix the major crack in the masonry. He said the original porch floor had been raised about 6" above the house floor at some point. He said they proposed to remove the overframing and recreate a flush floor condition, using salvaged fir floorboards from the second floor. Responding to questions Mr. Schilling said that they will likely keep the steel fireplace box insert, but remove the doors. He said the mantle will not have a curved face. He said he didn't know when the large stones were overlaid on the face of the fireplace.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Clay Eals, Southwest Historical Society, supported the work.

Mr. Sneddon asked what happens to the original material when the big rocks are taken off.

Mr. Murdock said that ARC recommended the applicant be in close contact with Ms. Doherty and to let her know if issues come up. He said that there are less intensive ways to remove the stones.

Mr. Shilling said they will remove the added stones one small part at a time. They expect the need to make repairs, and will source rocks to match.

Ms. Doherty said the goal is to reference historic photos when restoring its appearance.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interior alterations at the Fir Lodge/Alki Homestead, 2717 61<sup>st</sup> Avenue SW, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed lowering of the enclosed porch floor does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 118237, 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 proposed alterations to the stone fireplace will alter a feature specified in Ordinance No. 118237 in an attempt to recreate its historic character. Restoration of the concealed and/or missing features will be substantiated by photographic documentation and other physical evidence, as per Standard #6 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

### **071515.3 DESIGNATIONS**

Mr. Murdock explained the process for the designation portion of the meeting.

#### **071515.31 E.C. Hughes School 7740 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW**

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file) provided context of the neighborhood and site of the 1926 Floyd Naramore building. She said that Naramore and Brady added a wing in 1949. She went through photos – a virtual ‘walk around and through the building’ and noted the building is similar to the original Dunlap Elementary

although the ornamentation here is cast stone instead of terracotta. She pointed out the meeting room cartouche and proscenium arch and explained that the structural system was done in the 1990s. She said the wood columns are below and the corbels were retained. She noted the projection room as well as the classrooms and their original cabinetry. She said that the beams in the gym ‘play room’ are covered with acoustical tiles. She said that in 1949 the kindergarten was added; it is now a library.

She said that most changes are on the south façade. She said windows were replaced on the south elevation in 1971 and altered again in 2009. She said the electrical was upgraded and noted the exposed conduit. She said that seismic upgrades were done in 1979 and 1998; the 24’ chimney was removed. She said steel columns were added. She said the portables were added.

She said E. C. Hughes School doesn’t meet criteria A or B and it may or may not meet C. She said the school was associated with the development of schools as well as the community and development of Westwood and Roxhill neighborhoods. She said that the school is associated with Naramore and the schools built by him during this time; it shares similar details with schools of this time. She went through Naramore’s schools and later work at NBBJ and said it may or may not meet criterion E.

*Mr. Ketcherside arrived at 5:20 pm.*

Ms. Mirro said E. C. Hughes may or may not meet criterion F.

School District representative Tingyu Wang had no comment.

Public Comment:

Clay Eals, Southwest Historical Society, supported designation and said the school meets criterion C and said it was built at a time of a real boom in West Seattle where growth was moving from north to south. He said it is a miracle it is still around and it is a neighborhood treasure. He noted the cultural and economic heritage of the area.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker supported designation and said that the building is emblematic of its time. She said the Colonial Revival style is connected to the growth of the nation and the rapid growth in this area. She supported criteria C and D, exterior, 1949 addition – not exposed electrical, meeting room, cafeteria and central entry.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on criteria C and D. He said it is an important cultural asset and representative of early growth in the community.

Mr. Luoma supported designation on criteria C and D. He said that although it may be a duplicate school even if it was an exact replica it is in a different community and neighborhood and representative of that community's values and culture. He agreed with the Staff Report.

Ms. Shadid supported designation and said she loved seeing the kindergarten bay evolve into a square shape. She supported preserving Naramore's full catalog and footprint. She supported criteria C and D and agreed with the Staff Report.

Ms. Wine supported designation; she noted its integrity and the body of Naramore's work.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on C, D and F. He said that there are not too many buildings in these neighborhoods that are representative of time and architect. He said that the groundswell of Colonial Revival related to the sesquicentennial celebration. He said that although a duplicate it is another interesting facet of Naramore's school story; he noted the slightly different variants with standardized principles.

Mr. Murdock asked if criterion F should be added to the motion; there was board support.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the E.C. Hughes School at 7740 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW 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 exteriors of the 1926 building and 1949 addition; the meeting room/cafeteria; and the central entry hall.

MM/SC/SSH/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

071515.32

Magnolia School  
2418 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue W

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file) and went over context of the neighborhood and site. Responding to Mr. Luoma's question about the ramps at the nomination meeting she explained that the upper portions of the ramps are on the site. She provided photos and did a 'virtual tour' of the interior and exterior of the school. She noted the meeting room with typical lattice truss, proscenium arch, unique carvings and plaster ornamentation. She said the truss is supported on corbel and pipe column behind. She said the windows are original. She noted the classroom cabinetry.

Ms. Mirro said the building did not meet criteria A or B. She said that it may or may not meet Criterion C and noted the association with the school district and the development of the Magnolia neighborhood, and the association with Floyd Naramore. She said that this is one of three schools in Magnolia. She said that it may meet Criterion D and said that it is a duplicate of Laurelhurst but there is terracotta here where Laurelhurst has cast stone ornamentation. She said they started with the same plan but it evolved differently. She said it is similar to other schools and it doesn't stand out among them. She said that Naramore was influential and had a wide impact on schools and local architecture. She said that it may or may not meet Criterion E. She said that Magnolia School may meet Criterion F because of its scale in the neighborhood and its prominence on the way to the park.

School district personnel had no comment.

Ms. Wine said that the floor-to-floor heights seem higher than other schools.

Ms. Mirro said that it is typical.

Mr. Murdock said that it might be that it is sitting high on the site.

Mr. Luoma asked if Naramore was involved in the site selection.

Ms. Mirro said that there is nothing listed about his involvement in site selection. She said his office would give a presentation on the proposed siting of the building on the property and the district would give feedback.

Mr. Luoma asked if the land had already been purchased.

Ms. Mirro said the site had been part of earlier annexation. She said most school sites were in use prior to the construction of the buildings we see today.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the 1940 brick.

Ms. Mirro said that it is a concrete structure with brick veneer. She said on that the east façade of the 1940 building brick was left off for possible expansion. She said that the original portion had the ability to expand.

Public Comment:

Sylvia DeForrest, Magnolia resident, supported designation. She said her husband and family attended the school, and she had served on the PTA. She said it is sad to see it empty where it was once teeming with children. She read

a letter from the Magnolia Community Council in support of designation (in DON file).

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine said that even in a state of disrepair the building has integrity. She said the height of the corridor seemed more striking to her and she supported designation of the classrooms. She said that Bagley was compelling and full of life and here it is empty, windows boarded. She said there are a significant number of classrooms intact. She supported designation and suggested including more interiors.

Mr. Luoma said it was eerie and he was reminded of how much people using a space bring life to it. He said the west façade has a commanding presence. He said that he was not as taken with the interior spaces. He said that there is historic fabric there but it is not any different from E. C. Hughes.

Mr. Murdock said it embodies its history even without inhabitants. He said there are lots of historic light fixtures. He noted the trim and hand lettered sign on trim work. He said he was not sure where to limit interiors.

Discussion ensued about interior details trying to reach a consensus about how to narrow down the area of controls. Board Members asked about a previous school designation. Ms. Doherty said the Board had not been able to reach a conclusion on how to refine the interior controls and asked Staff to address this in the Controls and Incentives negotiations.

Mr. Murdock said the school was cohesively done and the location of the additions started off with bays on each end.

Ms. Wine noted the change in flooring materials but that the finish material was cohesive. She said that some classrooms had been altered over time.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on C, D, and F. He noted its massing in the neighborhood, its visibility from Magnolia locations and its visibility from the park. He agreed with the Staff Report and inclusion of other spaces.

Mr. Luoma supported designation on C, D, and F. He said the 1962 aerial shot provided a unique perspective. He noted the building's dominant location and how it was sited, oriented in the larger sense of the neighborhood. He said he supported the Staff Report and was not opposed to including the classrooms as some have historic fabric. He supported including the four stairways. He said there was no specific ornament but noted the nice spatial quality.

Ms. Shadid supported designation on criteria C, D, and F and the Staff Report. She said she would defer to her colleagues on the interior.

Ms. Wine supported designation on C, D, and F and noted her support for any classrooms original in form, defining wood work, trim around, chalkboard, storage cabinets, shelving, light fixtures, volumes, doors, book room, four stairs. She said that overall the school was eerie and noted its beautiful simplicity,

Mr. Sneddon supported criteria C for its relationship to Magnolia and growth of residential area D and noted the sympathetic additions, and F related to the park. He said that Ms. Wine's suggested inclusions sound reasonable.

Mr. Murdock agreed. He supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He said the building is on a ridge and is visible.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Magnolia School at 2418 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue West 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 exteriors of the 1927 building and the 1931 and 1940 additions; the meeting room/cafeteria; the first floor central entry hall; the original classrooms that remain, the light fixtures and doors in the hallways; and the four stairways.

MM/SC/EW/SSH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

#### **071515.4 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator