



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 3/17

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday, January 4, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel, Vice Chair  
Kristen Johnson  
Aaron Luoma, Chair  
Jeffrey Murdock  
Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon

### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Kathleen Durham  
Emily Vyhnanek

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

## **010417.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

October 19, 2016

MM/SC/JM/KJ

8:00 Minutes approved.

November 2, 2016  
MM/SC/DB/RK 6:0:2 Minutes approved. Messrs. Murdock and Sneddon abstained.

November 16, 2016  
MM/SC/RK/DB 6:0:2 Minutes approved Mr. Murdock and Ms. Patterson abstained.

**010417.2 APPOINTMENTS**

010417.21 Columbia City Landmark District  
Reappointment of one member to the Columbia City Review Committee

Ms. Frestedt explained that Amanda Keating will be reappointed.

Action: I move to reappoint Amanda Keating to the Columbia City Review Committee for a third 2-year term ending April 30, 2018.

MM/SC/DB/JM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

**010417.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

010417.31 Columbia City Landmark District  
3806 S. Ferdinand St. – Columbia Motors Building  
Proposed exterior alterations – window replacement and paint colors

Ms. Frestedt explained that the proposed exterior alterations consist of installation of a wooden storefront system and a new entry way, including proposed paint colors for the window trim. Exhibits included photographs, plans and samples. The Columbia Motor Company Building was constructed in 1921. The building is listed as a contributing building in the Columbia City National Register District. The building is a one-story commercial building clad in brick. On December 16, 2016, the Architectural Review Committee reviewed the application. Members of the ARC asked clarifying questions about the configuration of the transom windows and asked whether consideration had been given to retaining the double door entrance. Members stated that the work would be an improvement and did not voice objection to the proposal. A Columbia City community member provided public comment and spoke in support of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Owner Mark Hannum explained the intent to bring the building back to its original appearance with divided lights above, large picture window below. He said that two windows that have been boarded up will be opened. He said that the front storefront will be configured to include a center door with two side lights. He said the proposed paint color is close to the existing trim color. He said that originally the building was an auto sales office; there were double doors so they could bring the cars in. He said

the wooden roll up door will remain and they will paint it to match the rest. He said they have no plans for the alley side now.

Public Comment:

Rob Mohn, Columbia City property owner, spoke in support of the changes.

Ms. Barker said that the proposed single door was discussed at ARC; she said that the proposed configuration makes sense given that the interior is divided into different suites.

Ms. Patterson disclosed that Mr. Hannum is on the board of the Washington Trust, where she works.

There were no concerns with the disclosure.

Mr. Sneddon noted the restoration of the transoms.

Ms. Barker noted that windows were being reopened.

Mr. Luoma said it is a big improvement and returning to the original look of the building.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval exterior alterations to restore the storefront windows at 3806 S. Ferdinand St. as proposed, and to paint the roll up garage door the same color as the window frames. This action is based on the following:

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

**Guidelines/Specific**

**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:

- a. Repainted with the original historic color(s) of the building, provided that the business or property owner obtains a professional color analysis; or
- 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.

**4. Storefront.** Building facades should have a greater proportion of window and door openings than wall spaces on pedestrian levels. Any exterior façade alterations shall respect the original architectural integrity of the storefront. Recessed entryways and/or alcoves shall be maintained for existing street-level storefronts. Original fenestration shall be preserved (i.e. windows, transom areas, and or door design). Storefront materials should be brick, wood, concrete and tile or a combination thereof.

**Secretary of the Interior's 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.

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.

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

MM/SC/RK/JM            8:0:0    Motion carried.

010417.32

Gas Works Park

2000 North Northlake Way

Proposed alterations to Play Area and adjacent Play Barn

Pam Alspaugh, DOPAR, explained the proposal to restore the play area, meet accessibility and safety standards to clean contamination (details in DON file). She said they will raise the play area level with paving and lawns but will maintain the same footprint. She said the remnant wall, tank deck, play barn, and trees will remain. She explained that they will raise the lower elevation 3 ½' which allows for ADA compliant access, and a better connection between play barn and activity area. She said they will build the footings on top of existing soil instead of excavating. She said that PSE is doing arsenic removal and then adding a vapor barrier; footings will be placed on top to raise the area level. There will also be a new monitoring system of wells built into the area. She said they will replace the circular wall in the play area with concrete wall and put in brick patio; she said that they worked with Nicholas Vann and Richard Haag.

She said they will remove the porch but will keep the roof of the porch and support it from the building face. She said they will remove two wood decks and replace them with wood benches. She said they will remove ramp because it currently doesn't meet ADA. She said they will raise the area by the white tank 6" by bringing the surfacing up; they will raise the white tank as well. She said they will retain surrounding walls. She said they will add brick paving below existing seating and install sand box / play area. She said the 6"

x 12” brick is not available so they will use 3 ½” x 11 ½” which is the largest they can get; it is the same color and will be installed the same way, sand-set. Photos were provided.

Ms. Doherty said that the applicant had briefed the ARC with play area and other park improvements. She said the briefing was in 2015 and two options for the play equipment were presented to ARC which they deemed both compatible.

Ms. Alspaugh said they would like to keep both options available.

Ms. Barker asked about plans for the play barn.

Ms. Alspaugh said they will add musical instruments, replace some siding and some posts.

Ms. Barker asked about input from Rich Haag.

Ms. Alspaugh said the change in elevation was a concern – he really liked that it was originally recessed below the adjacent grade.

Mr. Luoma asked the color of the rubberized surface and the sand box.

Ms. Alspaugh said the surface will be sandy brown. She said that the sand box will sit in ground at top bank of concrete curb. She said that the PSE remediation is ongoing and they hope to eventually make this an access point down to the beach.

Ms. Patterson asked about the motivation to reinstall the white tank.

Ms. Alspaugh said that it would be a bit shorter if not raised. She said that they will remove the sliding poles from the original smoke arrestor hood and will assess condition. She said they will repair or replace in-kind.

Ms. Barker asked if they will retain the porch roof.

Ms. Alspaugh said it is not on these plans but KPFF (structural engineer) said they can provide support design.

Ms. Doherty said that if the board is OK with it she can review these details administratively.

Mr. Luoma asked if the circular concrete wall is a tie back to the original shape.

Ms. Alspaugh said it will be a circular seat wall and the circular concrete wall is original to the park design.

Mr. Murdock asked if they plan on opening up the side of the Play Barn.

Ms. Alspaugh said it is not easily doable now (related to seismic performance) but they are continuing looking at it. She said the triangular cut-outs will remain for now.

Mr. Luoma asked about the musical instruments and if they have thought about acoustic spread.

Ms. Alspaugh said it will not be loud and clangy but if they find noise to be a problem the instruments can be removed. She said they will see how it works.

Public Comment:

Tom Grant, Friends of Gas Works Park commended Pam and Parks on the application and for the good discussions and exchange of ideas. He said that DOPAR did a good job considering and incorporating their input. He said they are comfortable with what is moving forward.

Mr. Murdock said it is a safer and more open play area and what is proposed respects the historic character and raises the standards of the park.

Ms. Barker said it would be interesting to hear Rich Haag's take on the design. She said she is OK with what is proposed.

Mr. Sneddon said it is quite a change from the original design but that it is reversible, removable. He said that children's recreation areas don't remain static.

Ms. Alspaugh said that Rich Haag's design was innovative at the time.

Mr. Luoma said that playgrounds, like kitchens, undergo change and after a number of years, updates are likely. He said this is not a big impact to the historic character of the park. He said they have done a good job of balancing a number of difficult situations. He said that Rich Haag's design and the Gas Works history are both significant. He said that he appreciates that some ruins and remnants of 1970s design are kept.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed alterations to the Play Area and Play Barn at Gas Works Park, 2000 North Northlake Way, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 121043, 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.
3. With the condition that the porch roof supports can be reviewed administratively.

MM/SC/KJ/JM            8:0:0    Motion carried.

010417.33    Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center  
4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street  
Proposed removal of four trees

Jeff Barton, EC Management, explained the necessity of removing four hazardous trees. He provided arborist report and recommendations. He provided photos of trees 390 and 414.

Ms. Doherty said that SDCI has tree removal rules and Mr. Barton has been working with an arborist to make the assessment. She said that other trees have been removed as previously reviewed by the Board. She reported that since the designation of this property in 2013, the Landmarks Preservation Board has approved the removal of ten trees in 2014 (plus one lost to wind), and two additional trees in May 2016. Based on the tree survey provided by the property owner's representative, the Board has encouraged the owner to prepare a comprehensive vegetative management plan, to strategically address the removal of hazardous trees, and the potential planting of replacement trees.

Mr. Kiel asked if the removed trees will be replaced.

Mr. Barton said only if required.

Mr. Luoma said it is not required under SDCI.

Ms. Doherty said the board could recommend it. She said the board had asked a number of times for a comprehensive vegetation management plan to help expedite their review.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if screening trees on edge of property were being replaced.

Mr. Luoma said he understood why a planting plan would be deferred until there was a project designed for the site.

Mr. Murdock said that over time the character of the landscape is changing.

Mr. Barton said that there are over 400 trees on the site; he said there are lots of saplings. He said the trees are a replenishing resource.

Ms. Patterson asked why only some of the similarly rated trees are proposed to be removed.

Mr. Barton said they prioritize via appearance, core samples, and what might fall upon something.

Ms. Patterson asked if they do decay testing of attachment.

Mr. Barton said they will hopefully take down the attachment and noted the close proximity to building. He said that Lombardi Poplars don't do well in this environment.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma said he had no issue with removal and noted that the trees are hazardous. He said that Lombardi Poplars have a shorter lifespan and we will see the removal of more. He said there are saplings everywhere.

Ms. Barker said it was nice that they came to the board before the trees were removed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the removal of four trees at the Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center, 4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed continued tree removal may adversely affect the site character as specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 742/13). However, the applicant has demonstrated that the trees pose a safety concern.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/JM/KJ            8:0:0    Motion carried.



010417.41

Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center

4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street

Request for extension

Nathan Rimmer explained the request for an extension and said they continue to work with the Academy for Precision Learning; they are trying to figure out how to set it up and how to manage / maintain the property. He said the property will be listed for sale the end of first quarter of 2017.

Mr. Luoma asked if its landmark status will be clear to potential buyers.

Mr. Rimmer said it will be part of the discussion and the incentives could be a benefit that is discussed.

Mr. Luoma asked if the Academy has shown potential interest.

Mr. Rimmer said they are interested but there are things to work out, like finding a partner.

Ms. Barker asked how many C&I extensions they have asked for.

Mr. Rimmer said it has been over a year.

Ms. Barker said that Mr. Barton hadn't heard of a vegetation management plan; she asked what they can do to put together a vegetation management plan to satisfy the board.

Mr. Rimmer said that it is ad hoc and they are just maintaining it; it should happen as part of a comprehensive campus plan / design.

Ms. Barker said to tell people coming in to ask for approval for any tree removal.

Mr. Luoma said that unlike a building that does no one any good to just sit, a vegetation management plan can only be an evaluation without knowing plans for the future.

Mr. Rimmer said they have a full tree inventory and at least 70 are dying / decayed that would warrant removal; they are just identifying the need at the time.

Mr. Luoma suggested a 3-month extension rather than the requested six-month. He said it will allow for board check-in on status of sale, offers received, etc.

Ms. Doherty said that a 3-month extension is reasonable and appropriate.

Public Comment:

Colleen McAleer said she was surprised to hear about the sale – there had been no notice. She applauded the Board's role. She said the site is in a single-family area and has special use permit operation. She said to look carefully at the use and character of the site and suggested an institute of higher learning / think tank type use.

Story Swett said a comprehensive vegetation plan is important. He said it is apparent that the time elapsed has taken its toll on the property, on plants and buildings. He said there has been a limited amount of maintenance and it has taken its toll. He said the overgrowth of ivy and invasive species are impacting trees; these are things that should be considered by conscientious ownership.

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

MM/SC/RK/JM 7:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker opposed.

**010417.5 DESIGNATION**

010417.51 West Coast Printing  
622 Rainier Avenue South

David Peterson, Nicholson Kovalchick, explained he would present supplemental information in response to board questions at the nomination meeting (nomination report in DON file). He provided context of the site and a brief historical overview of the neighborhood. He noted important Nihonmachi buildings just north of the site – the Japanese Language School and the Buddhist temples.

He reported that the Wittwer family business sold hair switches, hair rinses and shampoos, with Golden Glint Shampoo a nationally popular product that lasted into the 1950s. He said the building was constructed to manufacture Golden Glint Shampoo. He said the family also built the Assembly Hotel. He said the Schack, Young, and Myers design was more ornate that was built. He said the building is two stories with a small basement. He said there was a label room, girls dining room and Japanese dining room – board members asked what that meant. He said he couldn't find anything on the dining area set-up.

He said Paul and Ted Tomita started West Coast Printing which was located on Jackson in 1930. He said that in 1942 the Tomita brothers were interned; Caucasian friends maintained the business for them until they were able to return. He said they had a lot of Chinese and Japanese type which survived one fire but was destroyed when the south end of the building was firebombed.

He said that most of the site is undeveloped. He said that most windows have been replaced, panels inserted, upper aluminum sash installed in the 1950s; there are a few original wood sash windows on the rear upper level. He said the URM building is on concrete foundation. He said the upper floor is now used by a tenant.

Mr. Peterson said that Schack, Young, and Myers produced an enormous amount of work and had a structural engineer in their firm which was unusual.

He said they designed the Hotel Morrison, the Japanese Baptist Church, and the Chinese Baptist Church, 320 Terry among many others. He said they did many buildings, but no other manufacturing buildings. He noted comparable nearby buildings: Liberty Sidecars, Black Bear Manufacturing, Liberty Cleaners and Dryers, Rainier Electric Oven, and Field Roast Grain Meat.

He said that he was unable to find information regarding the company's Japanese staff; he said that most material he found was on Japanese-owned businesses. He said that there were other local cosmetics companies from the same era; he noted that there was no FDA oversight and small salons made their own products. He said Golden Glint was available nationwide by the 1920s. He said the building didn't meet any of the criteria for designation.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board discussion:

Ms. Johnson did not support designation although she noted it was an interesting story. She said that any cultural significance it may have in Seattle was not significantly associated with the building.

Mr. Murdock said it was an interesting report. He noted the architectural detailing and said it is structurally expressive with a quiet gravitas. He supported designation on criteria C and D. He noted the segregation of women and Japanese staff and noted the proximity to the International District. He said the WWII movement of the Tomita brothers to internment camps and the 1992 fire-bombing are evidence of social and racial inequality which is visible in the building. He said the building conveys its stories.

Ms. Patterson said she was unsure but noted the Golden Glint product was around for a significant period of time and had wide range of distribution of products. She said she was leaning toward supporting designation on Criterion C.

Mr. Sneddon had similar opinion to Mr. Murdock and noted he supported designation on criteria C and D. He said that this is the earlier era of powdered shampoo and noted that the liquid form came out in 1927-28 in Europe. He said the building represents the industrial building in the 1920s. Regarding Criterion D he said you wouldn't know this was a manufacturing building and this is a good representation of what they were trying to do with manufacturing buildings in the 1920s. He said the building is significant to Japanese community and related to printing. He supported designation on criteria C and D.

Mr. Ketcherside appreciated Mr. Peterson's extra research. He said he did not support designation and noted it did not have integrity and it was not built as it

was designed. He said he was drawn to the plans that showed the Japanese and Women's dining areas; he said it was an oddity but there was no story around it nor did anyone speak up for the story.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation and said there was no double significance associated with Criterion C.

Ms. Barker said it is an anonymous building and even though it is on a corner she said it doesn't meet Criterion F. She said there is not enough to Golden Glint to boost it to significance. She said it doesn't meet Criterion B or D. She said she was leaning to supporting designation on Criterion C.

Mr. Luoma said he was leaning to support designation on Criterion C. He noted that there had been no community input on this building. He said the building can still convey what it was and he noted how little there is around it.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of West Coast Printing at 622 Rainier Avenue South as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard C; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: a portion of the site comprised of Lots 5, 6 & 7; and the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/JM/MSN 4:4:0 Motion failed. Mmes. Johnson, Patterson, and Messrs, Ketcherside and Kiel opposed.

**010417.6 NOMINATION**

010417.61 Crescent-Hamm Building  
4302 SW Alaska Street / 4559 California Avenue SW

Ms. Doherty explained there would be presentations by applicant and ownership.

Ms. Barker disclosed that she participated from 2014 – 2016 in the Historic Survey Group; she explained her role and said she was not involved in the nomination of selection of the consultant.

The Board and the property owner said that Ms. Barker's participation in the proceedings was acceptable.

Applicant Presentation:

Clay Eals, Southwest Seattle Historical Society explained that five organizations worked on the nomination for which they received a grant from 4Culture.

Flo Lentz explained the 1926 Victor Voorhees building was constructed for Crescent Dry Goods. She said the building meets criteria C, D, and F. She said it was constructed during an era of vibrant growth in Seattle. She noted the high-end finishes and said it was a visual anchor in the neighborhood when it was built and it is now. She provided context of the area and said platting started in 1888; she said the transportation network had everything to do with the development of the neighborhood. She said beach level was first, and then with ferry service, cable and railway residential appeared in the Admiral area. She said the electric streetcar line triggered logging, platting and real estate sales. She said in 1907 two lines met at California Avenue S.W. and S. W. Alaska and provided service north to Admiral, and west to Fauntleroy Cove, and east to downtown. She said the junction developed and in the early teens the largest building there was the Seattle Electric Company Building. The Campbell Building – across the street – was the first permanent masonry mixed use building at the Junction. She said that after WWI and with the paving of streets West Seattle grew fast.

She said that in the 1920s there were eight new building in the permanent type – masonry-concrete – and architect designed. She said they had a larger footprint than the small wood structures. She said that when complete in 1926 W. T. Campbell develop two lots and hired Victor Voorhees to design a modern apartment block. She said it has concrete base and foundation, simple storefronts, transom windows, canopied entrance that provided access up to apartments. She said that William T. Campbell was an educator, realtor, politician, and booster of West Seattle. She said he was a commercial develop who left a lasting legacy in the Junction.

Ms. Lentz said there have been various uses of the building over time – Crescent Dry Goods, drug stores, dentist office, ladies wear, grocery, jeweler, and Easy Street Records which has been there since 1989. She said that changes over time include signage, canopies, covering and uncovering the windows. She said Campbell sold the building to Alice Hamm in 1931. The building was sold again in 1968 - she noted the building was listed in the newspaper as a “landmark”.

Sarah Martin reported that Victor Voorhees moved to Seattle in 1904; he designed a wide range of buildings and published the Western Homebuilders Plan. Buildings designed by Voorhees include Washington Hall, the Lloyd Building, Georgetown City Hall, Arcade Building in Pike Place Market. He retired in 1950s. She noted the buff brick, terracotta ornament, upper and lower zones reflecting different uses in windows; flat roof, brick parapet, terracotta entablature, rosettes, and round architectural set-in terracotta panel. She said the building footprint remains unchanged. She said there are two main storefronts each on the east and south elevations. She said the south has inset center entrance, low masonry bulkhead and transoms; the east has side by side entrances and a roll up door. She said the east side has seen the most changes over time.

She noted the continuation of bay at corner and noted the metal inset storefront system is in the same configuration. She noted the 1/1 windows that bring light to mezzanine. She said the rear elevation faces the alley; it is unadorned, functional. She said inside the lower part is accessible to the public; that the mezzanine balcony serves both sides. She said the second story is private spaces and provides access to the mezzanine balcony. She said that apartments are organized along a double loaded corridor. She noted the ceiling height, plaster walls and baseboard trim.

Ms. Martin said that changes are typical and the building has maintained its quality and key features: buff and terracotta cladding and ornament; mass, size, scale, organization of primary façade; and general plan and circulation patterns. She said the building meets criteria C, D, and F. She said that the north storefront has the most changes of any of the storefronts. She said that by 1937 the storefront was removed to accommodate an open-air market. By the 1950s a more traditional storefront went in and then it went back to what is there now. She said the southwest corner is largely the same although the storefront materials have changed to metal.

Mr. Kiel asked what was beneath the blue paint.

Ms. Martin said masonry. She said that it is applied brick facing and is perhaps original material.

Mr. Murdock asked about the buff brick and terracotta.

Ms. Martin said they don't have architectural drawings but they have inspection notes. She said the 1937 tax statement provided the most information. She said the building is solid hollow clay tile faced with buff brick.

Mr. Murdock asked if the only original transom is at the corner.

Ms. Martin said that it is close but may not be original.

Ms. Lentz cited a couple images and said the building is more closely aligned with the 1926 version of itself.

Ms. Barker asked if the balcony level windows open.

They do open and they could be original.

Mr. Luoma asked how the electric bus trolleys going west on Alaska changed retail.

Ms. Lentz said that there was no streetcar west of California.

Ms. Martin said that West Seattle adapted to the change in transportation.

Ms. Lentz said the survey talks about changes over time to blocks on either side with the expansion of transportation.

Mr. Eals said that the four-way walk foot traffic pattern positively affected retail.

Owner Presentation:

Greg Gan and Tracy Hsia, owners, were present.

Larry Johnson provided context of the site. He said that the canopy and fan light on the south side have been removed. He said that they removed and modified the transom by 1937. He said there are now vinyl windows and aluminum storefront glazing. He said that entry door has been replaced and the entry canopy removed. He said that a temporary canopy was added, new storefront glazing at corner. He said the brick clad column and cornice are original. He said that the terracotta on column used to go down to sidewalk and was removed in 1956. He said the transom windows are covered. He said the north storefront has been changed and the veneer has been painted. He said that inside the mezzanine was changed in a 1991 removed; the railing is non-original. He said the two storefronts were combined; the storefronts have little integrity. He said the secondary façade is utilitarian and has non-original windows. He said the building is significant on the corner. He said there is some integrity in the buff brick and terracotta.

Owner Greg Gan explained the property is family-owned and that his uncle used to live on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. He said they were blindsided by the nomination. He said the building is part of their livelihood. He said they weren't asked about the building and they were left out of the process by applicant. He said they recognize the mass demolition of Seattle but they have no desire for change and they are paying the price for fear. He said they hope to pass the building on to the next generation. He said that management of the building takes lots of time and designation of the building will create financial costs for present and future tenants. He said they feel left out of the eminent domain-ish way this was done.

Mr. Luoma asked if the vents on Alaska come from the basement.

Ellen Mirro said there used to be a bar down there.

Mr. Murdock asked if there is basement access off California.

Mr. Johnson said there is.

Public Comment:

Peter Nelson, Vice President, Southwest Seattle Historical Society, spoke in support. He said there is strong support for preserving this building and he noted letters of support from former Seattle Mayor Greg Nickels and former City Councilmember Tom Rasmussen. He said the building is fundamental to the identity of the Junction.

Mr. Luoma said the board received and read public comment letters.

Ms. Doherty said that 27 more letters were received after close of business yesterday, and that the Board members had been given hardcopies at the meeting.

Crystal Dean, co-chair Southwest Seattle Historical Society, supported nomination. She said it is the Junction's "north star" and is for West Seattle what the Pike Place Market is for downtown as a whole.

Cody Othoudt supported nomination and said the Crescent Hamm building is a precious part of the identity of West Seattle. He said it is the number one answer to "what is your favorite building".

Karen Richter supported nomination and said the building is part of what makes the Junction, the Junction. She noted the small human scale and the sense of place that the building is part of. She said it is an anchor and noted the terracotta is special and beautiful.

Brad Chrisman supported nomination. He said he helped to establish the log house museum. He said that this is one of the most important heritage efforts; it has been there 90 years and is at the heart of the Junction and why people love the Junction. He said the extension of the street car line as the new center of West Seattle is how the Junction got its name.

Brooke Best, Historic Seattle, supported nomination of the building and said it proclaims its sense of place. She said these buildings represent the district and early 20<sup>th</sup> Century development.

Marcy Johnson, Southwest Seattle Historical Society, said preserving the building is important because when it is gone, it's gone. She said she grew up in the log house museum.

Jack Miller, local business owner, said he feels the owners' pain, but the building is a major part of the Junction and has to be preserved.

Daniel Fievez said he was disappointed that the owner was not notified by the applicant. He said that historic preservation is very important – Pioneer Square was saved and Pike Place Market was saved. He said a lot has been lost. He encouraged the owners' participation.



David Peterson said he worked in the building and commented on the architecture and the subtle relationship of the buff brick and terracotta. He said it is remarkably detailed in the terracotta to a level of quality you don't see except on banks.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and said she appreciated the report. She said there are changes but the building is so intact. She noted the cornice is still there and the fine terracotta detail. She said the window form is there.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination of the exterior only and said the terracotta is the defining feature. He said the cornice is still there. He said it is a shame there was no outreach by the applicant to the owners.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination on criteria C, D, and F. He said it is prominent in its location and he could support F as well. He said there was a street clock there in 1937 photo; it is still there but at Menashe. He congratulated the owners who had a vision and did it. He said the building is beautiful and they have maintained it and he hears the love community has for it. He explained that usually the community is caught off guard by a developer ready to tear a building down. He said that because the street clocks are designated they are still here.

Mr. Sneddon supported nomination and noted the connection to urban development and transportation. He said the building embodies the late 1920s mixed form. He said the building is finely decorated and is impressive. He supported criteria C, D, and F and noted the voluminous community support.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination on criteria C, D, and F. She echoed Mr. Ketcherside's comments about how the nomination process has gone with regard to owner involvement. She noted the community support for the great fixture the building is on the corner. She noted all the public comments. She said the board does not regulate use.

Mr. Murdock acknowledged the level of changes but said the building has integrity and conveys its significance even with integrity issues. He noted the original siding and quality of materials. He compared it to the Eitel Building downtown.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination. She said that it is impressive even with integrity issues. She hoped we can work with owners and said the process doesn't have to be onerous; the building can be preserved in a way that is reasonable.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination and said this building rivals anything in Queen Anne; he said it is a jewel. He said that there are not many others that are so framed by the development of transportation. He said the crossroads – junction – formed a dynamic space and helps to frame it as a gateway to the neighborhood.

He said that storefronts do change but the terracotta and features above are still there. He said it is readable and he supported nomination of the exterior.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Crescent-Hamm Building at 4302 SW Alaska Street / 4559 California Avenue SW for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for February 15, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/DB/RK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Doherty reported that she was in contact with the property owners starting in early October.

**010417.7 BRIEFING**

010417.71 Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Seattle Branch  
1015 Second Avenue  
Briefing of proposed addition

Mr. Kiel disclosed he is working on another Martin Selig project.

There were no objections.

Erik Mott presented via PowerPoint (in DON file). He provided a progression of design with focus on scale and massing. He went through photos of other Federal Reserve Banks which informed the process. He said the structural capacity is there for vertical addition. He said they added a shadow to delineate between old and new. He said there are setbacks at the hyphen and at the roof of the addition.

Jack McCullough said the same non-conforming condition with the view as the Maritime Building exists here. He wondered if that might be a good approach here.

Erik Mott said they made public realm improvements as well. He explained that there are two levels below the paving and said that walkable flush-set textured glazing is suggested. It provides some light and supports a variance.

Ms. Sodt said there will have to be another conversation about that.

Ms. Barker said she appreciated page 3 and asked what drove the hyphens.

Mr. McCullough said they have been back and forth with SHPO who has jurisdiction because this is a federal building.

Ms. Sodt asked if DAHP has seen the recent iteration.

Martin Selig said that Allison Brooks is OK with it.

Mr. Luoma said he did not like the skylight idea. He said it is good to have more public access but also retaining some of the bunker-like military grade.

Ms. Patterson said with the massing now the two hyphens and volume on top reads well. She said the ideal upper volume would be one story less so that the addition would be a little more subordinate to the bottom and the lower portion reads heavier and more dominant.

Mr. Murdock said he was OK with the proportions. He said a very light glass structure on top lends weight to the historic portion.

Mr. Ketcherside said a little taller will look proportionate.

Mr. Sneddon appreciated looking at the history of the design of federal buildings and the evolution. He said this is a modern interpretation and gives a sense of direction to the design.

Mr. Luoma said that straight up from the historic façade better complements because of historic tripartite structure of banks rather than looking like a cake topper.

**010417.8 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator