



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 563/19

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday September 18, 2019 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Russell Coney

Rich Freitas

Alan Guo

Garrett Hodgins

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Manish Chalana

Kathleen Durham

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

091819.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 5, 2019

MM/SC/DB/RC

6:0:0 Minutes approved.

June 19, 2019

MM/SC/DB/RC

5:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Johnson abstained.

091819.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

091819.21 Old Fire Station #18
5427 Russell Avenue NW
Proposed signage

Ms. Doherty presented on behalf of the applicant who proposed two new signs related to restaurant tenant. One long narrow sign lit by existing lights will be attached via fasteners in mortar at entry doors. A neon sign will be installed over single door. The big green EAT sign will remain.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hodgins said it was straightforward.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage at the Old Fire House #18, 5427 Russell Avenue NW, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #106052, as the proposed work 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/RF/DB 6:0:0 Motion carried.

091819.22 2006-2010 14th Avenue West Houses
Proposed exterior paint colors

Henry Li, property owner, said the two houses are next to each other and need to be repainted; proposed new colors necessitate board review.

Ms. Doherty said that Historic Seattle holds a preservation easement on the property and met with Mr. Li onsite. They approved the proposal.

Mr. Guo arrived at 3:40 pm.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior paint colors at the 14th Avenue West Group, 2006 and 2010 14th Avenue West, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #108211, as the proposed work 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/RC/GH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

091819.23

Fire Station #5
925 Alaskan Way
Proposed site fencing.

Ms. Sodt stated that ARC reviewed the proposal and wanted it called a gate, not a fence. The existing fence is on the side; the gate will connect that fence to an adjacent post 6' away from the edge of the fire station and Ivar's.

Mr. Freitas asked if there was overflow parking there.

Charles Sasse said that there is just this area next to the fire station for parking; it will be locked after 10:00 pm.

Ms. Sodt said there is public access until 10:00 pm.

Mr. Coney said 16' isn't a wide radius and limits parking.

Mr. Sasse said they juggle around. He said the articulated fence is not workable at that size and weight; they are willing to jockey cars around as needed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed gate at Fire Station No. 5, 925 Alaskan Way, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed gate does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #125021, as the proposed work 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/RF 7:0:0 Motion carried.

091819.24

Firestone Auto Supply and Service
400 Westlake Avenue North
Proposed partial demolition and development.

Jack McCullough said it has been a painstaking process and they have received great guidance from ARC.

Eric Mott went over the timeline of ARC meetings and said it speaks to the guidance related to this project about preservation and restoration and the new addition. He

said some restoration is underway; paint has been stripped and non-original glazing has been removed. He said they are readying for work.

Mr. Mott went over preservation activities:

- 1) Upper story windows steel sash is deteriorated. Propose to replace in kind to today's energy code and match original profile.
- 2) Terracotta is deteriorated in places. Looked at GFRC – ARC said no. ARC said to replace in kind color and glaze to match. Installation method will be better, back ventilated rainscreen installation.
- 3) Stucco deteriorated, water infiltration. Replace in kind to match original. Elastomeric product proposed; ARC said no, replacement should be true stucco.
- 4) Alley requirements per SDCI and City require widening; propose preserve a portion of alley to frame an urban space.
- 5) Soft light to accentuate building. Lumineers in ground or in retail entry or integrated into metal work as part of restoration. Subtle lighting to be carefully integrated.

Addition

Used proportionality, scale and other cues for addition. Designed to allowable zoning, carving from that to arrive at massing. Board asked for separation of old and new. He said 10' setback will be on Westlake and Harrison sides. Modulation to create dialog between old and new; separation with hyphen. Historic building is tripartite; new will have tripartite organization.

Proportionality

Balconies and horizontal bands. ARC said develop more consistently and to add balconies and bands. Balconies sit within sculpted voids which is a method to break down massing. A series of vertical elements that bring in light and shadow. Restore and refurbish existing building materials: stucco, concrete, metal, glass. Picking up on same materials and re-using in addition.

Mr. McCullough explained the response to board comments and said that they plan for this building to be the largest living building in the United States when done. He said that it is being done in conjunction with a landmark is special. He said that solar panels have been purchased to feed into the grid. He said they have permits in and façade cleaning is in process.

Ms. Barker asked if a full drawing showing elevations was available; she said she needed to see that or a full rendering as it would be awkward to approve without it.

Ms. Mott said they have shown it at past ARC meetings.

Mr. McCullough walked through the drawings which show corner and pedestrian level street view. He said the solar panels will not be on the building; they are in Prineville, Oregon and will feed into the grid.

Ms. Barker said technically the drawing should be in the packet.

Mr. Kiel noted the project progressed linearly.

Ms. Sodt said there are four elevations in the packet.

Ms. Barker said she wanted a full rendering.

Mr. Freitas asked if the height differential between the parapet and cantilevered portion will be seen.

Ms. Mott said you will see 4 – 5’.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle said she appreciated the proposed restoration and alley but noted it is still façadism. She said she was surprised that the Staff Report didn’t cite the Secretary of Interior Standards which is supposed to be used. She said the proposal should meet the standards. She said they are just grasping for something to back the decision and she said that didn’t seem right. She said she had not seen this before; it is unusual and surprising. She said she will provide a handwritten note that Historic Seattle wants to be a person of record.

Mr. Kiel said the building holds its own. He said Ms. Woo brought up some interesting points. He said it is good, and unusual, to have applicant replicate the actual terracotta.

Mr. Hodgins said the owner has done a nice job of restoring original building; there should be more of this. He said he was OK with the structure on top. He said aside from Historic Seattle’s comments, the project has followed a linear process with ARC. He said he hadn’t heard major objections from other board members.

Ms. Johnson said it is unusual and it feels like the base of the future building. She said this had a strong roofline. She said the mass size scale of the building is unusual and it is not overwhelmed by the redevelopment. She said the project progressed through ARC. She noted it is like the Federal Reserve building base is being used as an example for future projects.

Mr. Freitas said the design has been responsive and there are legible cues taken from the landmarked building. He said the alley wraps around, they have replaced terracotta and stucco in-kind. He said the new building is not to maximum height. He supported this project and noted he didn’t support the Federal Reserve project.

Mr. Coney said the terracotta restoration specifications provide detail about how things will be done. He appreciated the scale, size, fenestration proportions. He said the project benefitted from give and take and back and forth; everything has been incorporated nicely. He said the windows are a nice match. He appreciated the restoration of stucco and terracotta. He said that every building is unique and will have a different focus. He noted the transom window removal and said the one on Harrison is not original. He said the lighting is unobtrusive and highlights the Firestone Building.

Mr. Guo supported the project and noted the owner has been responsive to the board and ARC. He said the Firestone Building looks good.

Ms. Barker appreciated the sculpted voids and the interplay of the addition; the project has come a long way. She encouraged balconies that make it more elegant but noted the material seems cheap. She said the alley wrap could have gone on more, but it was OK. She gave kudos for the terracotta restoration. She supported a larger setback and less height. She said there is no real meaning to the setback height. She asked the rationale for not including SOI 9 in the motion language that is typically used.

Ms. Sodt said the language was used for other similar projects: 777 Thomas, 901 Harrison, Troy Laundry, New Richmond Laundry, Van Vorst Building, Seattle Asian Art Museum. She said the board can modify the language.

Ms. Barker asked why the language was used and said she preferred the standard language.

Ms. Sodt said it is language Staff has used for a long time and it includes the relevant Code language. She said it is important because of what the Code says about reasonableness or lack thereof. She said some factors don't apply because it relates to the School District.

Ms. Barker suggested inclusion of verbiage that states work is compatible with SOI 9 in the motion.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the new addition and partial demolition as described in the application submittal and submitted plans for Firestone Auto Supply and Service located at 400 Westlake Avenue North.

This action is based on the following:

1. In regards to *SMC 25.12.750 A, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significance change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Designation Report*: While the proposal includes partial demolition, a 15/10 foot setback of the addition from both the Westlake Avenue North and Harrison Street elevations is proposed, therefore the primary elevations, including a portion of the alley façade, will remain prominent.
2. In regards to *SMC 25.12.750 B, The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner*: The applicant has responded positively to feedback provided by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to explore the maximum set back of the new addition on the roof, as well as the compatibility of the design of the new construction with the historic building--the design has evolved to incorporate ARC feedback.
3. The other factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C and 25.12.750 D are not applicable at this time in the process.

4. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features in the Designation Report 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*.

MM/SC/DB/GH 6:1:0 Motion carried as amended. Mr. Freitas opposed.

Agenda reordered.

091819.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

091819.51 Bricklayers Building
318 Fairview Avenue North
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the building is at the end of the streetcar line and explained the request for four-month extension. She said an RFQ is being issued and they are waiting to bring design concept to incorporate the building into the end of the line.

Mr. Freitas asked if it is still used and said it feels abandoned and it needs some maintenance.

Ms. Sodt said it is used as temporary construction office. She said she would alert the owner about occupancy and graffiti.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Bricklayers Building, 318 Fairview Avenue North, for four months.

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

091819.52 The Showbox
1426 1st Avenue
Request for extension

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary requested a six-month extension. He said they are looking into the no controls process. He said they are looking at architecture and structural engineering aspects and how they might build around the key elements on the second floor. He said they are looking at legitimate concepts and what might work.

Mr. Kiel asked if exploration includes the parking lot next door.

Mr. McCullough said no, they wanted to much for it.

Mr. Coney asked if they looked for anyone else to purchase the site.

Mr. McCullough said they are open to that concept and they are taking steps to encourage that.

Ms. Barker asked if it is business as usual for the occupant.

Mr. McCullough said yes, for another 3 – 4 years. He said a six-month extension on Controls and Incentives makes sense.

Ms. Sodt supported a six-month extension.

Mr. Kiel asked why they are looking into no controls and not just going to Hearing Examiner now.

Mr. McCullough said they want feedback on options; what is feasible. He said they want to preserve as much as they can. He said as studying they want to be able to say they have done everything they can to preserve the building. He said they are looking at where to put structural columns, cores; if the kitchen would stay or go; all inform design decisions.

Ms. Sodt suggested 3-months minimum extension given the time needed to review information submitted by the owner in the future.

Mr. Kiel said they appear to be trying to convince us not to go the Hearing Examiner and still no controls.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for The Showbox, 1426 1st Avenue, for three months.

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

091819.3

DESIGNATION

091819.31

Bash House
4238 12th Avenue NE

Jack McCullough said David Peterson did more research, and met with David Della and members of the Filipino community. He said letters of opinion were provided to the Board. He said historically, the community attempted to purchase the subject house for a clubhouse, but the purchase failed.

David Peterson said he did not believe the house was a landmark. He provided context of the site and reported that the house was built in 1908 for Albert Bash and his family. He noted the clinker brick and a variety of siding materials used. He said the ‘Seattle Box’ or ‘Foursquare’ a box variant, is a type not a style and Capitol Hill has many of them. He said there is an addition on the back and multiple unsympathetic additions. He said the house continues to be a rooming house with shared kitchens and bathrooms. He said the house interior is cut up and not in great shape. He said that while Mr. Bash was out of town, his wife and two daughters ran a boarding house in the home. The house was sold in 1919 to George William Cameron and from 1941 on there have been a series of owners.

Mr. Peterson said that he researched census records to see who was living in the house, and from the 1930s onward there were Chinese and Filipino roomers. He said that the

1927 photo of young Filipino men in front of the house was likely because the house was one they were looking to purchase, but ultimately didn't. He said residents of note included Victor Velasco, who founded a Filipino newspaper and Irineo Cabatit, a labor activist and Filipino diplomat. He said the Filipino experience was difficult to reduce to a one-page supplement to the report, so he concentrated on Filipino experience as related to the University of Washington. He said there were many references to Filipino clubs and gathering places, but it was unclear if the subject house was one of them. He went over topics and sources researched which included Mr. Victorio Velasco, the Filipino Forum Newspaper, Tyee Yearbooks, and Wing Luke Museum library collection. He said that efforts to create a Filipino student clubhouse resulted in purchase in 1965 of a community center for the whole community rather than just for students. He said the yearbook showed the Japanese club had a clubhouse; there was no picture of the Filipino club. He said perhaps the Filipino students aspired to have a clubhouse like the Japanese students had. He said in 1925 there was an attempt to establish a club at a house on 9th; research showed at house 4308 9th Avenue was residence to four Filipino students at the time. He said that Jane Garrott was listed as the house mother at the time. He said there was a second attempt to purchase / establish a clubhouse in 1926. He said that the owner, Lillian Cameron verbally told them they could buy the house; when they got there to sign papers, Mrs. Cameron said they had to pay half up front. They walked away from the deal. By March 1929 they had collected funds and there were controversies about the accounting of the funds. He said that what they really wanted was a space for everybody and they got that when they later purchased a property in Rainier Valley in 1965 to become a community center. He said they held fundraisers at Washington Hall. Before they had a clubhouse they met at YMCA, Eagleson Hall where they met so often, they were asked to stop, Denny Hall, Foreign Center, restaurants, Chamber of Commerce Building.

Mr. Peterson said that none of the criteria apply; the house has no integrity. He said that Criterion is not met because there is less of a connection to the house than they thought. He said it was a failed effort to have a community clubhouse. He said the Singerman and Satterlee houses are Seattle landmarks and are better examples of the house typology.

He said that through conversations with David Della, Dorothy Cordova, Pio De Cano, Jr., and Cynthia Mejia Giudici they determined there is no direct connection of the house to the Filipino community.

Mr. McCullough said the Board wanted more information and Mr. Peterson did the research; this was a failed attempt at a clubhouse. He said Mr. Peterson made contact with community members and got their input. He said they plan to bring in the nearby Canterbury Court property for nomination, and hope it will be designated.

Mr. Freitas asked if there were any common spaces in the house.

Mr. Peterson said the house was subdivided into apartments, but they kept the Foursquare Plan.

Mr. Freitas asked what makes a clubhouse and if living rooms were used.

Mr. Peterson said the group got too large and had to move to other places. He said they were thinking about the need for scholarships and about the bigger picture and what they really wanted for a gathering place.

Ms. Barker asked about the floor plan.

Mr. Peterson said it was not a good layout. The typical Foursquare type does not have huge open spaces. He said the Foursquare is a common house type; the front retains the features, but the rear does not.

Public comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said she appreciated the cultural history and exhaustive research. She said that Dorothy and Pio are authorities on the Filipino experience. She said Historic Seattle is the owner of Washington Hall. She said the house alterations on the back are nice and the house could easily be renovated. She cited Beyond Integrity as a route to understanding more layers of history.

Mr. Coney echoed Ms. Woo's comments and appreciated the exhaustive research and the work of Beyond Integrity. He said the Foursquare is common style and this one has been radically altered. It is chopped up and shows hard use. He did not support designation.

Ms. Barker noted Mr. Peterson's exhaustive research and the context provided. She said she appreciated reading Dr. Cordova's letter. She noted a recent project where Maria Barrientos incorporated the landmarked Parsonage into her proposed development. She said these houses are similar. She said ¾ of this house is intact and she supported designation on Criterion D. She said they could have destroyed the house but didn't, the front and sides are still legible.

Mr. Freitas appreciated the follow up and due diligence. He said often informal gatherings at homes and other places by under-represented groups are overlooked. He said the group met at Eagleson Hall, Denny Hall, Washington Hall. He said this house was not used as a meeting place / clubhouse. He noted the value of researching in other ways to discover information about under-represented groups. He didn't support designation.

Mr. Hodgins appreciated the process and the additional research done. He did not support designation.

Ms. Johnson did not support designation. She said it was like a historical scavenger hunt. She hoped the research Mr. Peterson did will be useful in the future for other nominations. She said the building is a nice house, but she didn't support designation.

Mr. Guo did not support designation. He appreciated the Filipino history and additional research done.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation.

Ms. Barker asked if additional information is attached to what is online.

Ms. Doherty said that if she had received additional information in advance she would have posted a link on the website. She said the information doesn't remain online forever, but she can keep PowerPoint, nomination, and all documents together in file and electronically so it is available for anyone.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the designation of the Bash House at 4238 12th Avenue NE as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not meet any of the standards, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/RC/RF 6:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker opposed.

091819.4 NOMINATION

091819.41 Crescent Apartments
5201 42nd Avenue South

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership provided context of the site and neighborhood. She conducted a ‘virtual’ walk around the building and noted the mesh screen wall wraps the west, south and east outer walls. She said the stairways are recessed into the building and the former pool has been filled in. She said there is corrosion on the decking and the first-floor pass throughs have been filled in. She said there was originally more transparency than you can see now. She said the building was featured in trade magazines in 1963 and noted to have a ‘typical’ interior. She said the aluminum sash windows have been replaced with vinyl.

She said the building doesn’t meet criteria A or B. She said the building meets Criterion C in a tangential way only with the development of Columbia City neighborhood. Despite the early adoption of rubber tires, Rainier Avenue, unlike Aurora Avenue, was not known in particular for its car culture, beyond having a few drive-ins and gas stations. The historic fabric of the early town remained intact, with intermittent industrial uses along Rainier Avenue and Empire Way stretching to the south. What is now known as Martin Luther King Jr. Way S was called Empire Way between 1852 and 1982. In 1961, however, the name Empire Way was briefly changed to "R. H. Thompson Parkway" until plans for the R. H. Thompson expressway were scuttled. Between 1960 and 1969 the neighborhood saw a minor building boom, with approximately 10 percent of all remaining residential building fabric in the neighborhood dating between those years.

The Crescent Apartments was designed with influences from the Modern Movement, with evidence of influence from the International Style, and from Pacific Northwest Architects. Elements of the style may have also been influenced by the futuristic Googie or Populuxe style on display at the 1962 Century 21 Exposition, the Seattle world’s fair.

She reported that in his "Mossback" column on Crosscut.com, Knute Berger says of Googie, “it’s the same era of architecture enshrined at the Jetsons-era Century 21 Exposition of 1962, the Space Needle perhaps being the ultimate example of Googie.”⁴⁸ The architecture of the Century 21 Exposition of 1962 exemplified the futuristic design ideals of mid-century design. This sometimes included round structures such as the geodesic dome of the Ford Pavilion and the clear spherical “bubbelator” inside the Washington State Pavilion (now a City of Seattle Landmark). The 1962 World’s Fair also caused an explosion of new hotel and motel-type buildings constructed around Seattle to house the expected visitors. These included

the Camelot on Pier 68 (1962, John Graham & Co. now the Edgewater Hotel), and the Imperial 400 Motel (1962, Van Horne & Van Horne).

The design of the Crescent apartment building may also have been influenced by the circular residential designs of Frank Lloyd Wright and his apprentice Don Erickson, along with the 1962 circular high-rises of Bertrand Goldberg in Chicago. She said the circular form turns its back to the sun and there are hardly any windows. She said a screen of expanded aluminum mesh hangs from the roof structure, cloaking the outside of the exterior walkway at the upper two floors of the building. The roof overhangs both the walkway at the outer wall of the crescent and the balconies at the inner wall of the crescent. This overhang is clad with a soffit of exterior plasterboard, with screened vents along the wall side of the soffit. The balconies and walkways have exposed cantilevered steel sections and corrugated decking at the underside. She said the building may or may not meet Criterion D.

Ms. Mirro reported that Richard Bouillon and Joseph Williams of Bouillon & Williams designed the building in 1962, with Olsen & Ratti as the engineer. Construction was completed by 1963. Rudy V. Simone was the contractor and developer. The owner was listed as a company called Crescent Apartments LLC, of which Rudy Simone was the principal. The advertised construction price was \$500,000. The original address was on Rainier Avenue S. Later in 1963, the building won an award for “outstanding apartment design” from *Practical Builder* magazine, which featured the building in its September 1963 issue. Sears L. Hallett presented the award to the architects and the developer at the Olympic Hotel in Chicago. According to the article, the major design challenge was to create a multi-family residential project in an area surrounded by “several less than desirable land uses,” leading to an inwardly focused design.

Bouillon’s work was primarily commercial in nature, never rising to the level of other Modernist Northwest practitioners such as Paul Thiry, Omer Mithun, Wendell Lovett, Fred Bassetti, and Roland Terry. Besides the *Practical Builder* award for the subject building, his only other known citation was an honor award from the Seattle AIA for a fountain at University Chevrolet Car dealership (1969, demolished). Bouillon’s firm completed a number of banks, auto showrooms and service centers, office buildings, warehouses, grocery stores, and shopping centers. Although residential projects were not Bouillon’s primary design specialty, he is known to have designed the Park Villa Apartments, a pier building that extends over the water. She said the building may or may not meet Criterion E. She said the building is not highly visible and may or may not meet Criterion F.

Anne Tonks, owner, said she has owned the buildings for 13 years. She did not support landmarking the building and she originally wanted to provide homes to people that she would want to live in. She said she was a volunteer in Art Asante in Arizona, an early leader in sustainability. She hoped to provided co-housing with the parking area becoming community garden. She said she now doesn’t see that as feasible. She said the building is at the end of its useful life and it looks like a prison. She said that density is important, and the site should support housing. She said it doesn’t meet any criteria. She said it sits behind another lot; when that lot is developed this site won’t be visible at all.

Mr. Coney asked about the aluminum screen.

Ms. Mirro said that most is original but there are a few patched places.

Mr. Hodgins asked if entry is at grade.

Ms. Mirro said that entries to lower to lower level are at grade and are not secure.

Mr. Freitas said it isn't a brise soleil, it is more of a privacy device.

Ms. Mirro said there are small windows for bathrooms and bedrooms. She provided clarification of floor plans and glazing and said most glazing is on the inner wall.

Mr. Hodgins asked when the pool was filled in.

Ms. Tonks responded it was filled in 13 years ago.

Ms. Mirro said that the 3rd floor units are said to get very hot; the best location was in middle, on the second floor. She said that most tenants don't stay very long. She said she knew of nothing exceptional about the building.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Docomomo WeWa supported nomination. She said they posted photos on their Facebook page and it was one of their most popular posts. She said there is nothing like this; it is unique in form and shape. She said it is Mid-Century Modern, not Googie. She said the pool is there; you just have to remove the cement. She said it is a one-acre site; there is lots of room for added density and new construction.

Ms. Barker said she just recently saw the idea of a screening wall to make a building function in different temperatures. She said the building is a striking example. She supported nomination on Criterion D. She said the building is one of a kind, unique. She wished it read like its rendering; architect was more intrigued with screening material. The building is not as successful as the drawing. She didn't support Criterion E.

Mr. Hodgins said he called the building a 'flying saucer'. He said the rendering looks great and the pictures show a lifestyle. He said the swimming pool is north facing; the screen covers the building; the courtyard changed, and windows have changed. He said the building feels depressing now. He said it is a weird building; the screen probably didn't work out the way they had initially hoped.

Mr. Freitas said he was conflicted; the building is modern in design but not in ethos. He said it is turning inward and north facing. He said the brise soleil is not used as a brise soleil. He said he didn't think it was a successful place to live. The building does represent an architectural period.

Ms. Johnson said she was conflicted. She said it was a bold idea and looks like an alien dropped into the neighborhood. She said it is emblematic of its time. She said really great designers related to what was going on with the sun, and outside. She said the building showed an attempt at designing for community. If detailed

beautifully she would support nomination, but it doesn't shine. She didn't support nomination.

Mr. Coney said the article about the builder was interesting. He noted there was no effort made for nice details. He said the screening is interesting; it stands out although it is not real visible. He said it was not a high-end design, but the building has done well over the years. He said it is a unique structure but if it had a right-angle shape, it wouldn't be here for discussion. He did not support nomination.

Mr. Guo concurred. He said that at first he appreciated the building but the more he looked at it, it feels off. He said it doesn't have the feeling of the era. He said that every unit is pointed at the pool and the pool is gone. He didn't support nomination.

Mr. Kiel said site planning matters. He said he valued the place as an object but not as a place to live; it turns its back on the neighborhood, has no elegant detail, and only the shape is distinctive, which is not enough for a landmark. He said the ethos of Modernism is betrayed by this building.

Ms. Barker said the Standards states that "...must be at least 25 years old and must have character, interest, or value or can convey..."

Mr. Coney said it is close but doesn't quite get there.

Ms. Johnson said it is a novelty; being unusual doesn't make it a landmark.

Mr. Freitas said it solves a design problem about the neighborhood use, but it is an object not a place. He said you can make an argument for anything, but in the process, you see there is no benefit of comparative context. One of a kind doesn't mean it is a landmark.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Crescent Apartments at 510 42nd Avenue South as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not meet any of the standards, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/KJ/GH 6:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker opposed.

091819.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator