



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 189/19

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday April 3, 2019 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Russell Coney
Kathleen Durham
Rich Freitas
Alan Guo
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Manish Chalana
Garrett Hodgins
Steven Treffers

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

040319.1

MEETING MINUTES

December 19, 2018

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

040319.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

040319.21 Harvard-Belmont Landmark District
Cass Turnbull Garden at 1125 Harvard Ave E
Proposed landscaping

Ms. Nashem explained that the Code specifies that regulation applies only to what is visible from a public right of way. Merrily Chick of the Harvard Belmont Committee and staff met on site. The Estate is a living trust that will eventually be transferred to SDPR. Plant Amnesty has agreed to lay the groundwork for a public garden at the site. It was determined that all the work of the landscaping, with the exception of the trees, could not be seen from the public rights of way because of the height of an existing retaining wall therefore only the planting of the trees along Prospect Ave would require a certificate of approval. At the time of the original site visit the applicant was still determining the species of trees to propose. Ms. Chick has now reviewed the species of tree and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Dominic Barrera, Plant Amnesty, and Jack Bausch presented and noted the site is 1.23 acres.

Mr. Barrera provided street views and said high wall covers most of the property. He provided planting list and map. He said the tree along the wall will be visible; they proposed Dawyck Purple. He said that all plants are donated.

Mr. Bausch said it is a labor of love. The garden will be in memory of Cass Turnbull. He said that one of the first heritage trees was on that property. He said they have monthly work parties there.

Mr. Freitas asked about three Beech trees against wall.

Mr. Bausch said they are along south wall on the inside; only tops will be visible from outside.

Ms. Durham arrived at 3:40 pm.

Ms. Barker asked who design the house.

Mr. Bausch said Bassetti. He said this is in a landmark district; the house will be preserved as well.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Coney said there was a day camp there.

Mr. Bausch said there was a tunnel for kids and friends that came up in the yard from the Stimson property. It is closed off now.

Mr. Coney appreciated the work and said he was glad there is public accessibility.

Mr. Freitas said it is great.

Mr. Bausch said they intentionally selected a columnar tree to reserve the vision of the wall.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for planting of three *Fagus Sylavaticus* “Dawyck Purple” trees in the area of the Cass Turnbull Garden at 1125 Harvard Ave E as proposed.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed landscaping plans as presented April 3, 2019 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the district as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

I. STATEMENT OF INTENT AND PURPOSE

The Development and Design Review Guidelines identify the unique values of the district and are consistent with the purposes of the district and other criteria of SMC 25.22 which created the Landmark District. The guidelines identify design characteristics which have either a positive or negative effect upon the unique values of the district and specify design related considerations which will be allowed, encouraged, limited or excluded from the District when Certificate of Approval applications are reviewed.

Within the District, a Certificate of Approval, issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board, is required prior to the issuance of any city building, demolition, street use, or other permits for proposed work which work is within or visible from a public street, alley or way, and, which involves:

C. The addition or removal of major landscape and site elements, such as retaining walls, gateways, trees or driveways.

In addition, for proposed removal or addition of significant landscape and site elements for which permits are not required, and which are identified specifically in the district Development and Design Review Guidelines, a Certificate of Approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board shall also be required prior to the initiation of the proposed work.

2. CRITERIA AND VALUES

The Board shall consider the following criteria/values in the utilization of its Guidelines:

A significant number of buildings within the Harvard-Belmont Landmark District individually embody distinctive characteristics of early twentieth century eclectic residential architectures. These buildings and the mature landscaping which forms their backdrop, collectively create a contiguous streetscape and a neighborhood that are compatible in terms of design, scale, and use of materials.

3. GUIDELINES

B. SETTING

1. General

Guideline: New development in the District should not obstruct existing views. The ultimate height of new trees and other landscaping should be considered so that they do not become so dense that views are blocked.

2. The Block

Guideline: Maintain yard space, especially that of front and side yards visible from the street. Front yards should not be used for parking areas. Protect or add trees and landscaping to help reinforce yard edges.

3. Landscaping:

Guideline: Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.

Guideline: Privacy of existing properties should be preserved.

MM/SC/DB/RC 6:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Durham abstained.

040319.22 Magnolia Elementary School
2418 28th Avenue SW
Proposed exterior signage

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Ms. Doherty said SPS recently made a briefing to the ARC about a second proposed building addition. She explained the proposed signs and indicated locations. Address numbers are per SFD code; they are 8" high, black aluminum pin mounted to concrete. Similar letters are on northwest corner of school for identification.

Ms. Barker said it is pretty basic; it is driven by SFD.

Ms. Doherty said the historical sign at the west entry will remain.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said ARC thought it was reasonable, removable and recommended approval.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage at Magnolia Elementary School, 2418 28th Avenue West, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed change does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 435/15), as the proposed signage 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/KJ/RC 6:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused.

040319.3 DESIGNATION

040319.31 Turner-Koepf House / Beacon Hill Garden House
2336 15th Avenue South

Betty Jean Williamson from Beacon Arts, and Katie Pratt and Spencer Howard from Northwest Vernacular presented; presentation materials in DON file.

Ms. Barker disclosed she has volunteered in many areas of the city, and noted an associated acquaintance is in the audience. She said she has no discussions with this person about the Board's business.

Steve Gillespie of Foster Pepper, attorney for the property owner, said they had no objections to Ms. Barker's participation.

The Landmarks Board members had no objection to Ms. Barker's participation.

Mr. Howard said the building is listed on the National Register. He said it was built prior to the 1890 plat and the lots stem from the 1890 Walker Addition Plat. He said it was built in 1886 per the King County Assessor property card. He said it is one of the oldest houses on Beacon Hill. He said the house was built for Edward and Estelle Turner in the Italianate style by local carpenter J. D. Duncan. The Turners purchased the 4-acre site in 1883.

He said the pear orchard was established by 1924. He said between 1906 and 1916 the house received its Queen Anne facelift undertaken by the Koepf family to reflect the more popular, modern style. Changes included the front turret extension to the canted bay, a wraparound porch, a west extension of the living room, the front concrete steps, eave and bracket changes, and dormers. The floor plans illustrate the original construction by the Turner's, historically significant additions by the Koepf family, and historically significant alterations by the Jefferson Park Improvement Club. Early rear additions focused on kitchen expansions and a back porch. The Queen Anne conversion expanded the existing south porch to the west, extended the first floor west, and added a porch along the north side. Later additions by the Koepf family expanded the second floor out over the first-floor kitchen addition. Alterations for the Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club for use of the building as the Beacon Hill Clubhouse are shown in orange and expanded the first floor north, enclosing the north porch. These changes each occurred during historically significant use periods for the house

Mr. Howard said the building is two-and-a-half stories with a rectangular footprint. It conveys both the Queen Anne style with elements of the original Italianate design evident. Brick and concrete foundations support the original house and subsequent additions. Exterior features that remain and were constructed as part of the original 1886 Italianate-style building include the main two story house, V-groove horizontal siding, the building's hip roof, the canted bay at the second story, window casings with the projecting moldings and articulated plinths and pilasters and second story west and south window openings, 2:2 basement windows. Exterior features that remain and were added as part of the Queen Anne conversion include the front turret above the canted bay, gable roofed dormers, shingles at the turret, dormers, and south porch, rafter extensions with scroll cut brackets, the south porch and front entrance, including the concrete stairs and tympanum over the entrance, the 1:1 sash that replaced most of the original 2:2 sash, the pear trees south of the house (five remaining), the rose off the northeast corner of the house. He said the 1936 aerial shows the pear orchard, with individual trees circled with green dashed lines. The 2019 aerial at right shows those same dashed green lines overlaid on a 2019 aerial. The outlines align with the existing trees. The 1936 aerial was georeferenced from a larger aerial using street intersections and then refined based on the parcel boundary. This is a rare example of a home fruit orchard in Seattle of this age. Pear trees have been a significant feature of the site for at least 90 years. The majority of the trees

remain to convey their significance. They consist of a group of fruit trees planted in a regular geometry of two rows. They are European pears, of Dr. Jules Guyot or similar, are ungrafted, planted from seeds or seedlings. There is regular spacing between (roughly 26 feet) and within rows (roughly 15 to 17 feet between trees). They have tall trunks (2 to 3ft) before branching. The topography is generally level with mounding around the base of each tree and the fruit tree area established below the street and alley grades. The Turner Koepf pear trees are one of the only known groups of pear trees in South Seattle, and one of the largest known concentrations of pear trees in the city. The pear trees and site are unique among known groups of residential fruit trees in the retained spatial relationship with the original house and grounds. Comparative examples include the following:

- Piper's Orchard, one of the oldest orchards in Seattle, with the oldest known pear tree, est. ca. 1890, located between Greenwood and Broadview in north Seattle. (also a Guyot pear at the Piper home in West Seattle)
- Good Shepherd Center (Meridian Park), includes apple, pear, and plum trees, located in Wallingford.
- Burke-Gilman Trail, apple trees along the trail, including several by Gas Works Park.
- The Rainier Valley has a high concentration of fruit trees.
- Plum trees are scattered throughout the North Rainier Valley related to Italian immigrants settling in the areas
- Dr. Jose Rizal Park, apple trees, located at the north end of Beacon Hill.
- Amy Yee Tennis Center, apple trees, located in the North Rainier Valley directly east of the Turner Koepf House.
- Martha Washington Park, cherry and apple trees, located in Rainier Valley just south of Seward Park.

Mr. Howard said that the interior layout generally consists of storage and mechanical space in the basement; event and associated support spaces comprise the first floor. Offices are on the second floor, with a former caretaker's residential unit at the east end of the floor. The attic consists of storage space. The front entrance opens to the stair hall with a mahogany stairway continuing to serve as a key circulation feature. The main meeting room volume created by the Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club by enclosing the north porch occupies the west two-thirds of the first floor and served as the main social and public use space within the building for club functions and community use. A 2001 remodel installed new wainscot and crown molding, added wall sconces and can lighting, and painted the ceiling and refinished the floor. The original volume, ceiling beams, and pendant lighting remain. The kitchen continues to function as food preparation space and a kitchen with other portions of the east additions converted to restrooms and storage spaces.

Ms. Pratt reported that the house is an example of the second wave of residential development in Seattle as the city boomed in the 1880s. During the 1880s, in anticipation of the arrival of an extension of the Northern Pacific Railroad, 67 new subdivisions were filed by developers in and around Seattle. Most of the north end of the Beacon Hill closer to downtown was platted in the 1870s. The area containing the house was part of the 1890 Cyrus Walker and Emily Walker plat known as Walker's Addition. The 1901 map shows street car line service to the area along Beacon Avenue S, prior to the grading and full establishment of the platted roads. By 1906 street grading and curbing, sewer and water line construction were underway and completed by 1908 in the area around the house. Concrete sidewalks were added by 1908 in the area around the house. The streets were planked by 1909 in the area around the house.

The Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club founded in 1912. They were key advocates for the continued development of streets, lighting, paving, and sidewalks in the neighborhood. The period from 1904 through 1916, corresponding with the Queen Anne conversion of the house, brought a second wave of residential development and growth for the neighborhood.

Ms. Pratt reported that in 1883 the Turners bought the land. They had the house built in 1886 and sold it that same year to the Stacys. The Stacys had a large Second Empire style mansion built in 1885 at 3rd Ave and Marion Street making it unlikely they lived in the house. Their housekeeper, Sophia Bopp was the widowed younger sister of Frederick Koepf. Ca. 1887 the Gabel family purchased and possibly lived in the house. 1889 Koepf purchased the house and lived in it until his death in 1920. His wife, Laura, lived in the house through at least 1921. Frederick was a civil engineer who worked with a private company, then the City, the Port of Seattle, and King County. Philip Gabel officiated at the July 1890 wedding between Frederick and Laura. In 1923 the Koepf family sold the house to the Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club (JPLIC) who used the building as a club house for club and community functions through 1977. In 1977 the club gave the house to the Washington State Federation of Garden Clubs who sold the house in 2018 to the current owners.

The property remains one of the oldest houses on Beacon Hill and its parcel size reflects the land purchase prior to plating of the area. Founded in 1912, the JPLIC's founding members were: Annie E. Winsor, Jennie Palmer, Lulu Hall, Carrie E. Hall, and Rhoda E. Flaherty. The transition of the Koepf family from the house provided a unique opportunity for the club to purchase a building within the neighborhood for use as a club house. Following purchase of the house in 1923, the club hired carpenter and original house builder J. D. Duncan to transition the house from single family to club house use with cloak rooms for men and women and club meeting rooms on the second floor. Between 1925 and 1929, the club expanded the first-floor

meeting room by enclosing the north porch and continuing the window pattern along the west facade set by the Queen Anne conversion. By 1929 the club had 129 members. The club house was called the Beacon Hill Club House.

Ms. Pratt reported that in addition to regular club meetings, they hosted an annual two-day carnival on their grounds, renting booths to merchants and hiring a merry-go-round for children; held monthly dinners when husbands of members could attend; held dances, lectures and card parties; the neighborhood Boy Scouts and Camp Fire Girls rented the meeting room for their meetings. The club house served as the activity base for the club's efforts over the next several decades to advocate for and promote improvements to Beacon Hill and Jefferson Park, including street grading, street lighting, paving and sidewalks and park restrictions.

Ms. Pratt reported that in 1976 the Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club listed the club house to the National Register of Historic Places. In 1977 the Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club, due to declining membership, gave the club house to the Washington State Federation of Garden Clubs.

There were two conditions:

- That the Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club could continue to meet at the club house; and,
- That as a National Register of Historic Places listed property it would remain in non-profit use

Founded in 1933, the mission of the Washington State Federation of Garden Clubs (WSFGC) is to coordinate "the interests of garden clubs to provide education, resources and networking opportunities for its members to promote gardening, floral design, civic and environment responsibility". In 2016 the Garden Club had the restrictive covenants nullified.

Ms. Pratt said as a former community club-owned club house, it is one of only two in the city that started as a single-family residence, the other was the West Seattle Community Club in the Admiral neighborhood. The subject property remains the oldest former clubhouse building in the city. It is one of seven remaining clubhouse buildings in the city, including Haller Lake Improvement Club, still in club use, club established in 1922, Sunset Hill Improvement Club, still in club use, club established in 1928, Mount Baker Park Improvement Club, still in club use and a Landmark, club established 1914, Women's Lakewood Civic Improvement Club, still in club use, club established in 1920, Arbor Heights Improvement Club, extant but used as a church, Queen Anne Club, extant but used as a gym.

The Italianate style was popular in the Midwest and San Francisco, with few examples remaining in Seattle as the style's popularity waned just as the city's residential construction began to increase. Turner-Koepf House was a clear

example of an Italianate residence as it was originally constructed with many of these features remaining intact. The two-story house featured a low-pitched hip roof with decorative brackets. Window hoods highlighted the tall, narrow windows. The house also featured a simple, squared off front porch. Other details included a two-story canted bay window and decorative scrollwork at the front and side porches. Other Seattle Italianate examples include two Seattle Landmarks: the George W. Ward Residence, the residence at 1414 S Washington Street.

Ms. Pratt said the Queen Anne style dominated residential construction in the United States from the 1880s until 1900, but persisted until at least 1910, which overlapped with a key period in Seattle's residential growth. The style borrowed from the Medieval-era Elizabethan and Jacobethan styles, utilizing steep roof lines, irregular massing, and mixed wall materials. The Turner-Koepf House was modified to have the appearance of a Queen Anne-style house rather than its original, boxier look as an Italianate residence. Many of the features added as part of this change remain intact. A wraparound porch was added, along with a turret cap to the original two-story bay window, emphasizing the asymmetry of the house's principal facades. The building's roof shape was altered to have a steep pitch and the original Italianate brackets were modified (or replaced) with decorative rafter tails to highlight the angle of the eaves. Patterned shingles replaced more simple panels on the bay window; these shingles also clad the wraparound porch to provide additional texture to wall surfaces. Other Seattle Queen Anne examples include Seattle Landmarks: Victor Steinbrueck Residence; 14th Avenue Housing Group; List-Bussell Residence; Fisher-Howell Residence; William H. Thompson Residence.

Owner's Presentation

Steve Gillespie, the owner's attorney, thanked the Board and community members and said he was encouraged to see the level of community involvement and enthusiasm for the house. He said the owners share the enthusiasm for the house and want to find an economically viable way to keep it alive. He said they support designation of the structure, noting the community and political importance but asked that the lots north and south of the house be excluded. He said the plantings in the north lot are not old.

Pamela Vuong, representing her family's ownership of the property, said they are members of the Beacon Hill community and were raised there. She said the Garden House is a local landmark and her goal is to operate her bakery there. She said they want to restore it for that purpose. She said it is her dream to have a cozy gathering space where everyone is welcome. She said she is honored to open a minority and woman-owned business. She said they support designation and love old buildings for their beauty, character, and structure. She said they have not been too vocal so far, fearing controversy

and judgment by the community. She said she has been the recipient of online bullying over this matter. She said most don't see the entire picture and don't understand. She said they care about the house. They purchased the house to save it and got more than they bargained for. She said that sometimes landmark owners are real people like us, not the 1%, not developers. She said the outcome of being a landmark has real consequences. She said it is a challenge to maintain 12,000 square feet of property. She said they have spent tens of thousands of dollars so far and haven't even touched the house yet. She said hopefully the bakery will be successful enough to maintain the house. She said they can't do everything. She said they appreciated the support of the majority of the community and the love of the Garden House.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, thanked Beacon Arts and the community for their interest. She provided context of the area via an aerial photo and identified the three lots that make up the property. She said she provided an arborist report to the Board and said that all of the pear trees were determined to be 39 – 49 years old. She said the period of significant ended in 1977 with the end of JPLIC ownership. She went over alterations to the house which included rear addition, turret and porch, north porch addition, north attic windows, north porch doors, alley façade – rear purchased enclosed, orange-peel texture upstairs, stained glass, entry door, and she noted there are some condition issues and deferred maintenance.

She indicated altered interior areas including MDF wainscot, restroom doors, wall paper, lighting fixtures. She noted water intrusion and condition issues. She identified historic and non-historic features (detail in DON file). She said the house is in good condition except there are no seismic upgrades, the front and side porches should be reframed, and a new foundation.

Ms. Durham asked how the arborist dated the pear tree at +/- 50 years and if there was evidence of re-planting.

Ms. Mirro referred to the arborist report.

Ms. Barker said she didn't read the tree reports. She asked if it is typical to plant a tree in the exact spot where one was removed.

Ms. Mirro didn't know, but noted personal experience where orchards were always the same.

Mr. Gillespie said that is outside the scope of what the arborist was asked to review.

Mr. Kiel asked the average lifespan of a pear tree.

Ms. Mirro said it is quite long, a couple hundred years.

Mr. Freitas said it could be up to 600 years.

Ms. Durham asked when the original lot was platted into three.

Mr. Gillespie said in the Walkers' Plat, 1890. He said the subject property is one tax parcel comprised of the three platted lots.

Public Comment:

Barbara Burrill said she is with City Fruit, a Seattle non-profit that harvests surplus fruit from home trees. She said they provide education and care for trees in public places. She said there are no pear trees at Good Shepherd Center and only pears at Piper's. She said a pear orchard is very rare and this is the only one she knows of. She said her colleague is an expert in old orchards up and down the west coast and thinks the trees are at least 100 years old. She said Guyot Pears are rare. She said she is very familiar with the history of Good Shepherd Center and Meridian sites. She said the opportunity to have a historic building is wonderful, but the orchard is part of the charm and history of the site.

Michelle Ishimitsu said she is the fourth generation of her family in Beacon Hill. She mentioned Seattle in Color and noted the environment's effects on emotional health. She noted the impact of green space on psyche and health. She spoke to the Vuongs and said she understands the overwhelming responsibility to the family, encouraging them to reach out to community; there are lots of resources available to allow them to continue to upkeep the property.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, thanked the community members, the Vuong family and Beacon Arts. She said the significance of the property is the entire site – the building and its setting. She supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. She noted the contrast of siting, and scale in relationship to the neighborhood and streetscape. She said Historic Seattle owns eight historic properties and knows what it takes. She encouraged due diligence before purchasing. She said there is an opportunity to create a wonderful community hub with the business. She said there are lots of opportunities and there are people here who can help. She said the online communication was unfortunate but noted the community is all here to help the owners.

Maria Batayola of the Beacon Hill Council said Beacon Hill is welcoming, diverse and healthy. She said she works in the Chinatown - International District where there is preservation of history, people, and living culture. She said it is part of the life of the community and there is an opportunity here to do both. She said both are important. She said the exceptional trees are

important. She said she did floral arrangements there and volunteered there. She noted the pictures of mothers on the wall. She addressed the Vuong family and said they are intertwined through unusual circumstances and that she understood it is hard for them. She supported designation.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, supported designation based on criteria C, D, and F. He said that this has been a social meeting space for 95 years is remarkable. He said that regarding Criterion D, most of the alterations are over 100 years old and the Italianate and Queen Anne styles are both evident. He said it is a unique integration of the site and building use; it has the same feeling of a 19th Century farmhouse on a large lot.

Susan Sherbina said she lives in the neighborhood and the trees have been there longer than 50 years. She said the basement of the building was formed by the women who founded the club; the husbands took buckets of dirt out when it was needed. She said the building is representative of and quirky as Beacon Hill.

Gina Tolentino, small business owner, said when she started her business there were lots of rumors and comments and she struggled. She said the community is tight and close knit and wants to help; it is like a family here and all want to support the owners. She supported designation.

Lora Martin said she has been a Beacon Hill resident for 30 years and she has used the Garden House. She said the “Beaconettes” performed there. She said she wants to work together. She said the Vuong family came to early meetings and talked about the Garden House. She said they didn’t know the Washington State Federation of Garden Clubs had removed the covenant. She said the deed states the covenant was removed. She said the family inherited some of the community’s bad feelings about that. She said they fundraised to seek historic status for the house. She noted there is widespread support.

Board Deliberation:

Ms. Barker asked how the Alki Homestead designation proceeded with an easement and multiple lots.

Ms. Doherty said the Homestead’s designated features include the entire site, the building exterior, and portions of the interior. Part of the site may be developed – where the parking lot was.

Mr. Coney appreciated the community support and said the site has a long history. He said it was a homestead before it was platted. He supported designation of the entire site. He noted the stewardship and said to make sure any development is respectfully done. He said designation doesn’t preclude

development. He supported inclusion of interior stairway. He said criterion C and F apply but not D because it is a mish mash of Italianate and Queen Anne.

Ms. Johnson said the number of changes is overwhelming. She thanked the owners and the community. She supported designation on C, D, and F. She said it is interesting how a new style was applied over the old. She supported inclusion of the entire site. She said she hopes the owners approach new development that supports the characteristics of the building. She said sometimes it takes new development to help maintain the building.

Ms. Barker supported designation; she agreed with the Staff Report, criteria C, D, and F, inclusion of entire site. She said it meets Criterion C in so many pieces – culture, women, community, plants/horticulture. She said it meets Criterion D and noted that even though the house has morphed, you can really see the Italianate. She said it was a conservative small house and from upstairs windows the views would have been staggering. She said it meets Criterion F as it is very prominent; she noted the spatial location with breathing room around it.

Mr. Freitas said he loves the idea of a house with an orchard and he was heartened by the public and community involvement. He noted competing narratives of site and landscape. He said arborists are worth their weight in gold, but there is other evidence of early ripening pears. He said it is a best practice in preservation of fruit trees. He said the diagram is compelling. He said the orchard is potentially a separate landmark. He noted the location, setting, workmanship, feeling of association. He said he supported designation of the entire site based on criteria C and F. He said he didn't support Criterion D because it is not a style, it is two styles and including it would undermine the others. He said to include the exterior, stair, rose, orchard, and site.

Mr. Guo thanked the community for sharing how important the house is culturally for Beacon Hill. He supported designation on criteria C and F; he didn't support Criterion D, calling the style a 'mish mash'.

Ms. Durham supported designation of the exterior, site, and main interior stair. She said it is fairly clear and she can understand the Italianate and Queen Anne styles. She said the eclectic nature of Queen Anne includes the adoption of Italianate elements. She said it speaks to the eclectic nature of Queen Anne style. She said criteria C, D, and F are met. She thanked the community and said it is remarkable to have such a showing. She said it is heartening the community supports the owner as well; there is a healthy future.

Mr. Kiel said criteria C and F are clear.

Ms. Durham said the language is distinctive and that if Mr. Kiel had been on the tour, he may have a different opinion.

Mr. Kiel said to include the main interior stair. He addressed the family/owners and said the Board is here to work with you and is glad there is community support. He asked community members to stick by the owners and noted the economics are hard. He said the Board will work with the owners on their project. He said there is public space inside and out, urban food production, education, and festivals. He said it seems in line with the vision for the property. He said that criteria C and F are clear.

Mr. Coney asked what was on the National Register.

Ms. Doherty said the house is listed. She suggested referring to the main stair from 1st to 2nd floor.

Mr. Kiel said he would defer to Ms. Durham's experience on the tour and would support Criterion D.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Turner-Koepf House / Jefferson Park Ladies' Improvement Club / Beacon Hill Garden House at 2336 15th Avenue South 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 primary interior stair from first to second floor, and the exterior of the house (excluding the 2006 addition on the north side).

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

Agenda reordered.

040319.5 BRIEFINGS

040319.51 Highland Apartments
931 11th Avenue
Briefing on exterior alterations for seismic improvement

Ms. Doherty explained they are in active Controls & Incentives negotiations. The Owner requested administrative review for a set of permit drawings. In reviewing the drawings, it was clear there are challenges with seismic upgrade – URM, lots of hollow clay tile, and they want to install concrete on exterior face of back side of building. She said ARC asked applicants to look for alternatives for treatment to back wall and recommended that the full Board hear the how and why for the proposed seismic improvements.

Jeremy Silvernail, the owner's representative, explained the owners wants to know if everything in the permit set would be proposed before signing a C&I agreement.

Ms. Doherty said this is unusual. The staff is concerned about including this language in the agreement, knowing that it is work that the Board may not have approved, and therefore may not want to recommend approval of the C&I Agreement.

James Herriott, structural engineer, provided structural drawings (details in DON file) and described structural implications. He said the façade at the back of the building is a simple brick wall. He said there are two wings with punched openings; brick veneer is 3 ½" with hollow clay tile the remaining 9 – 10" inside. He said the hollow clay tile is made in stubby t-shapes that interlock; all walls are frangible. He said the existing lateral system is super frangible. The brick veneer is not tied back with soldier courses into hollow clay tile. He said concrete out of plane bracing for hollow clay wall because they are covering the entire elevation with 6". He said they are providing in plane sheer wall on one side of box. He said the lowest floor of the building is concrete already. Structural action is dependent on coupling beams that link the piers. He said that any options leaving out beams leave out structural elements that tie piers together. He said the proposed design is an efficient and well-behaved system – doing in plane sheer wall and grabbing all hollow clay tile in a complete manner.

Ms. Johnson asked him to explain the interior seismic improvement.

Mr. Herriott said the courtyard expressed in rear facade, apart from that all floors are similar – they all stack. He said the structural system is a wall in front, a wall on back, plywood on east and west interior foundations. He said there is a lot of plywood being added.

Mr. Kiel asked about diaphragm.

Mr. Herriott said they will put plywood everywhere and also solve diaphragm. He said there are great hardwood floors, and this is how to save them.

Mr. Silvernail said 80% of the walls will be stripped.

Mr. Herriott said they will go over the height of the walls and through floors. He said the aspect ratio could show it was respectable.

Mr. Kiel asked if the west wall is thinner or does it cover all walls.

Ms. Barker asked if they had looked at what was done at PT&T Garfield Exchange Building bracing with elevator in back.

Ms. Doherty said that is a concrete frame building, so it is not an ‘apples to apples’ comparison.

Mr. Herriott said there is no change to the gravity system. The lateral system on front of the building has three bays; there are three different places with 2” shear wall inside and 6” thick on rear exterior. He said the interior part of the air shaft carries north to south lateral load; plywood shear walls 3 ½” thick on east to west connection. He said there is no reinforcement to diaphragm because of plywood shear wall. He said they will brace the parapet, wall anchors to floors.

Ms. Doherty said the goal of the briefing is to determine if they have made a case to add concrete to the exterior of the building’s rear wall.

Mr. Kiel said ARC wondered if there is a concrete or steel armature / grid applied to façade that could catch diaphragm and carry weight down.

Mr. Herriott said it is plausible, but it is more complex. Simple and holistic is preferred.

Ms. Durham asked how a typical window would be detailed.

Mr. Silvernail said the same as windows on the other side and paint concrete; referenced the detail.

Mr. Freitas said destruction of historic material is not in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. He said seismic retrofitting has to happen. He said he could support a non-traditional approach, but this would be the entire back façade. He said it is the elegance of solution versus historic fabric.

Ms. Johnson said something has to happen, if we want the building to remain standing. She asked if it would be valuable to see the anchors. She said the characteristic features of the building will still be there.

Mr. Silvernail said they want to keep the same layouts.

Mr. Kiel said he supports some of the exterior but that he would like to see what has been suggested run through.

Mr. Coney asked if there are examples of this being done elsewhere.

Ms. Doherty noted that the existing west courtyard has skim-coat concrete.

Mr. Silvernail said they want it to match what is there.

Mr. Kiel said they should do integral color because concrete cracks.

Ms. Doherty asked if they are proposing shotcrete or cast-in-place concrete.

Mr. Silvernail said it would be board-formed.

Ms. Durham said the plans note 'shotcrete'.

Mr. Coney asked about the process.

Mr. Herriott said they would use rebar and shotcrete.

Mr. Kiel said board-formed would be a better choice with better results around the windows. He said he could support that.

Mr. Coney said he could support it, especially if it is done well aesthetically. He said the approach is the least invasive.

Ms. Doherty asked if the Board had an opinion about integral color or natural.

Mr. Kiel said natural concrete would age nicely, and should not be painted.

Ms. Doherty said seismic work is typically reviewed administratively to determine if its consistent with in-kind maintenance. In this case, she informed the owner that the proposed alterations to the exterior wall would require a Certificate of Approval; but the owners said they did not want to do that. So, they are presently in a predicament; the owners will not sign the Controls & Incentives Agreement unless this work is done with Staff review.

Mr. Kiel said that is the path of least resistance. He questioned why the Board would allow an exception and not require the Certificate of Approval process. Without a signed Controls and Incentives agreement, the Board still has purview.

Mr. Silvernail said he wasn't sure that the owner understands this.

Ms. Doherty explained the options, and why the Board would not likely approve the current draft of the agreement.

Mr. Kiel said the property owner should follow the rules; the Board does Certificates of Approval all day long without a Controls and Incentives agreement. He said it is a standard practice for many. He said he assumed the owner wants to follow the process.

Ms. Barker asked if the owners have experienced this on other projects.

Mr. Silvernail said it is their first time through the landmarks process.

Ms. Doherty said one of the owners has a landmark property, but has never done this type of major work. She asked the board members if they would support administrative review of the proposed work, or by ARC, or just by board.

There was general agreement that the owner should seek a Certificate of Approval. If the owner is looking for the fastest way through, it is not hard.

Ms. Doherty said permits can't be issued until this process is done. She said to submit a Certificate of Approval and that she can address additional questions offline.

Mr. Kiel said to show the recess, parge coat, integral color, board-formed finish, etc.

Ms. Doherty said they will probably have to do control joints.

Mr. Durham left at 6:25 pm.

040319.4 **CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

040319.41 Highland Apartments
931 11th Avenue
Request for extension

Jeremy Silvernail requested a three-month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Highland Apartments, 931 11th Avenue for three months.

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

040319.5 **BRIEFINGS *continued***

040319.52 Volunteer Park
1400 East Prospect Street
Briefing on proposed removal of bandshell

Jennifer Ott, Volunteer Park Trust, explained what they believe this is the best option for the bandshell. She read the landmark description of overall character: "Volunteer Park is an urban park designed in the naturalistic, pastoral/picturesque

American romantic style that is closely associated with the Olmsted firm. The elements of this style include irregular open lawns bordered by shrub and tree plantings, carefully framed and modulated views, one or more circulation loops, and areas intended for crowds and social interaction which are treated in a more geometric and formal manner” (see landmark designation report for detail). She said the space was designed to be porous. She said the park is the most articulated and intact design of Olmsted design principles and how he intended it to be. She said the shelter house, conservatory, Seattle Asian Art Museum are all included in designation; the Haag elements are not.

Owen Richards, architect from ORA, said there is no reference to Rich Haag in the nomination’s statement of significance. He said the band shell is mentioned in the physical description of the park and history but not in the statement of significance. He said SAAM and the conservatory are both landmarked; the water tower is less significant but important to the character because of its history and is different from the band shell. He said there have been three different band shell structures and Haag’s design was part of the evolution.

Mr. Freitas noted Haag’s circulation patterns.

Ms. Ott cited the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes and said the structure is proposed to be rehabilitated to address deficiencies and needs for continued use and the long-term health of the park.

Mr. Richards reported that:

- Stage and restrooms are not ADA accessible and cannot meet ADA requirements without extensive changes.
- There are no useable backstage performer support spaces.
- The pathway behind the structure is too narrow for performance support.
- Rear pathway and restroom entrances do not meet CPTED Principle #1: natural surveillance. Due to the poor visibility and lack of defensible space, the restrooms are locked except during events.
- A roof over the stage is needed to provide sun/rain protection for performances.

David Graves, Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPAR), noted the safety issues and said this structure creates dark space behind it, the pathways behind it are not used, and the restrooms have been problematic and need to be locked.

Mr. Richards said other issues are performance needs:

- Stage and restrooms are not accessible / non-compliant with ADA requirements.
- Stage backwalls block appropriate stage/backstage access.
- Stage backwalls form a visual barrier to pathway: does not meet CPTED standards.

- Inadequate backstage performer support spaces. Storage and restrooms are 4' lower than stage making ADA conversion infeasible.
- Reintroduction of curved Olmstedian pathway is limited by existing structure.

Study A:

Remove center portion where the restrooms are; create new restrooms on each side, maintain angled walls, tuck support space with hinged panels to provide backdrop; retain edge condition but open up center to provide new roof.

Mr. Kiel asked if they would be adjusting the grade behind.

Owen said yes, about 2 ½'. He said there would be no change to the stage. He said the challenge with this one is in order to fit support spaces in, their roofs would be higher than the side roof walls and they would need a ramp to get up to stage level. He backstage support spaces would be awkward and constricted. He said there is a very large tree to the north, the pathway comes past; they would lose the pass-through around the tree.

Study B:

Keep stage platform, demolish the restrooms and back walls, new roof, extend front edge of stage, open up back to position support spaces; space behind is all new construction, configured for performance with stage level dressing rooms; ramp tucked in back without railings; interest in retaining as much as possible.

Mr. Kiel asked if there are compromises keeping the stage.

Mr. Richards said a resilient surface will be put over it; a concrete floor is problematic, and most pros don't use the stage. They will re-surface the concrete stage and floor structure would extend back. He said the integration of the stage is worth doing.

Ms. Barker asked if they will rake the stage to get drainage off. She asked about roof and if they had explored temporary or convertible roof.

Mr. Richards said most people bring temporary roof / canopy. He said they looked at retractable but noted maintenance issues. He said they will not rake stage; it slopes slightly to drain. He said they have no desire for a raked stage.

Ms. Johnson asked about roof.

Mr. Richards said it is primarily for weather – sun and drizzle, with music groups because of expensive equipment and instruments. He said a roof provides natural reflection to musicians.

Brian Giddens, Volunteer Park Trust, said they care about the park and the proposed design helps open up the park vistas and improves the overall aesthetics

better than others. He said the design has been carefully done to meet historic value of the park.

Thatcher Bailey, Seattle Parks Foundation, said they fiscally support the Volunteer Park Trust and could not ask for more attentive, thoughtful stewards. He said it is a testament to how much they care and he trusts their instincts for the park. He said the design brings the park to life. He said it is very important to SPAR that it is attractive, safe, and used.

Nancy Ianucci, Volunteer Park Trust, said the original design presented is preferred and hopes the Board will allow the existing bandshell to be removed.

Brooks Kolb, contributor to the Landmark nomination, said it was Ms. Ott who catapulted the nomination report above the standard. He said it was never their intention that the Rich Haag bandshell be part of what they were trying to preserve. He said they needed a cut-off date and chose 1975 and it just happened that the bandshell was included. He said they met with Mr. Haag, who said “get rid of it”.

Mr. Kiel said he supports the original design concept.

Ms. Barker said the Board has seen two other plans: one further north, and the most recent one to demolish and rebuild in the same place.

Ms. Ott said Study B is closest to that.

Mr. Richards said 9’ downstage of original plan there is a large flat area in front of stage.

Mr. Freitas said demolition is not reversible; must perform complete due diligence first. He noted the significance of the bandshell and the proposed rehab options. He said they made their argument the way the Ordinance was written, there is no period of significance, no contributing/non-contributing elements listed, so there are gray areas. He said the intent is to save the design, it is a living design with layers on top; Haag’s design is part of that. He said the park is more than the sum of its parts. He said the bandshell is not character-defining, but he is still resistant to demolition.

Ms. Ott said the Olmsted park design is harmed by this structure; a solid wall blocks views and it doesn’t fit. She said this is why she supported the art museum expansion – because windows were added which improved the landscape experience. She said the structure is in the same space. She said the historic integrity is in its function as gathering space, not the structure itself. She said especially if the stage is retained. She said the stage is “original”. She said this is part of the story of the park, part of another evolution.

Mr. Freitas said if this is a restoration back to Olmsted design, then move to original place and restore there.

Mr. Richards said if there are things that don't work, it is warranted, the building itself is not landmarked.

Mr. Freitas said it doesn't warrant demolition.

Ms. Ott said that safety is a big issue, as it was also at Cal Anderson Park. She said this space does not feel safe.

Mr. Kiel said it is easy for people to forget that.

Ms. Johnson said the hard part about landscape is that it changes. This is hardly a building, it is more an imposition on the landscape and seems like a temporary intervention.

Mr. Kiel said that by the time they do what you need to adapt it, what will be left is vestigial.

Mr. Freitas said he is not attached to the structure; he said he is attached to the demolition and the consequences of that. He said it is about a real space, a design intent, Rich Haag's design and grading. He said there is much more going on.

Mr. Richards said his design is more than the stage; it was re-grading and an intimate inner bowl that was very successful. He said the actual stage is not successful.

Mr. Freitas said you can get behind – retain the stage and sidewalls.

Mr. Coney said it is a slippery slope when you talk about demolition.

Ms. Johnson said it came up at Gasworks Park; with the standards of today, you couldn't have made that work Comfort Station work.

Mr. Freitas said that he eventually came around on that matter and noted contributing or not, it was seismically unsafe, non-ADA, and gender neutral.

Mr. Kiel said that the premise is that there is cultural significance to places, and they have value to the community. He questioned if a singular place in the park is not working, why preserve it? He said this is about community; it is not working and we should be willing to question why.

Mr. Freitas said they clearly have enough support to move forward. He said he was happy they explored other options.

Mr. Coney said this is the spot that works for a bandshell. He said Rich Haag said to 'blow it up' and take the whole thing out. He said it is impractical to rehab it and the design doesn't fit in with the park. He said he is not on board with design yet. He said to show more elegant formal design that is in keeping with the park.

Ms. Johnson said it is silly to retain portions. She said she didn't mind modern design and that faux historicism doesn't feel right.

Ms. Barker said saving only a floor is problematic. She supported the 2nd option but said she did not like the roof. She preferred something basic and anonymous that any performance could work in.

Mr. Freitas agreed with Ms. Johnson, that preserving a part loses integrity and is not worth doing. He said he didn't mind modern design and that the structure should be what it needs to be, including the roof.

Mr. Guo agreed. He said the structure should stay completely or be replaced. He didn't like the proposed roof and said the structure should blend more with the trees. He said the comfort station roof blends well.

Mr. Kiel appreciated the use of Cor-Ten steel. He said orientation of the restrooms makes sense. He said it is a clever, simple approach. He noted the way they are protecting back stage. He said the roof should be PNW Modern, clean, wood structure.

Ms. Doherty said at the last briefing there were similar comments about the roof being overwhelming and wanting it to be quieter. She said that today at least one person is uncomfortable with proposed demolition and Mr. Chalana also was at the last briefing. She said there may still be disagreement. She noted concerns with demolition and concerns with the proposed roof.

Mr. Richards said they will come back with evolution of the roof design.

Ms. Johnson said to explore acoustics and describe reasoning.

403019.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator