



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 297/17

### MINUTES

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

#### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Russell Coney  
Kathleen Durham  
Garrett Hodgins  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel  
Kristen Johnson  
Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon  
Steven Treffers  
Emily Vyhnanek

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

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

**050317.1**      **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
April 5, 2017  
Deferred.

**050317.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

050317.21 First United Methodist Church  
811 Fifth Avenue  
Proposed exterior alterations to the east elevation

Ron Wright explained they found it is technically infeasible to do what they proposed earlier so proposed a design that will allow more of the church to be visual. He said they proposed to bring across a more modern element that is more characteristic of the new high-rise. He said they changed the railings from pickets to glass. He said that the previously approved planter areas will be removed with moveable planters added instead. He said that the new proposed lighting fixture is a slim LED light bar that will attach to the main pilasters of the building.

Mr. Kiel asked if other options were explored.

Mr. Wright said they were but they couldn't balance it.

Ms. Johnson asked if the stair can continue straight.

Mr. Wright said that the rail will be uniform all the way across with no jog.

Ms. Barker noted the intent to reference the historic stair.

Mr. Kiel asked about removal of existing terracotta and replacement with pre-cast concrete per page 40.

Mr. Wright said they are replacing a couple pieces that cracked. He said that power source is inside and they need to penetrate the slab. He said they had the same issue when putting boxes in.

Mr. Kiel said historical material is being removed for this option but the original option meets the intent better.

Ms. Patterson said the original proposal had less impact overall and does a better job.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Treffers said one option has less visual impact on the building and the other has less material impact. He said he was leaning toward the revised option because there is less visual impact on the building.

Mr. Coney said the small fixture has a narrow profile.

Mr. Wright said the building is missing the cornice and there is stucco there now; it would be better if the cornice were there because the lights could be mounted there.

Ms. Johnson said she was comfortable with either option and said that visually, she preferred the revised option.

Ms. Vyhnanek liked the revision but was concerned with loss of material.

Mr. Wright said that 40% of the building now is precast and they will be using the same precast molds they used in 2008.

Ms. Patterson asked the wall and rail height.

Mr. Wright said there is no increase and will be along the same line as the top of the slab.

Ms. Johnson said that ARC liked the glass because you can see the church and was OK with the removal of landscape and having it open.

Mr. Coney asked if the light can integrate into the landscape.

Mr. Wright said it is the entry to the whole building and there will be more paving.

Mr. Coney said he likes the post mounted light bar better than attachment to the building.

Mr. Wright said they have to have cane detection equipment.

Mr. Sneddon was fine with either option.

Mr. Ketcherside was fine with either option and said there are advantages either way. He said to reuse-salvage the terracotta pieces.

Mr. Wright said they are reusing pieces saved from 2008.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for exterior alterations at First United Methodist Church at 811 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123291 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible

with the massing, size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/DB/JP            11:0:0 Motion carried.

**050317.3            DESIGNATION**

050317.31            Frederick Boyd Company/American Meter & Appliance Building  
1001-1005 Westlake Avenue North

Mr. Treffers disclosed his mother-in-law, Kate Krafft, was part of the survey team in 2014. He said this work was done before he moved to Seattle and has not been discussed.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary, went over changes to the building and noted the loss of integrity. She said prior to the building's construction a gas station occupied the site. She said the building plans were approved in 1919; permit issued in August 1920 and occupancy was in 1920. She said that original plans were by Hurley Mason and Henry Bittman was identified as engineer. She said the level of design indicates the building was design-build. She said it is unclear whether Boyd ever occupied this building. She said a second floor was added in 1924; Boyd filed the building permit. She went over subsequent sales of the building and said there were various tenants over time.

Rob Mawson, Heritage Consulting presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON file). He said the building was not important and is not in the database or architectural literature. He said the building survey does not offer specific analysis of where or how resources are significant. He said narrations is not footnoted. He said there was no critical analysis of why it should be designated. He said the building does not have integrity to convey significance and he noted that ¾ of the building has been altered. He said the building didn't meet any of the seven aspects as listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

He said the building didn't meet any of the criteria for designation. He said the building is not representative of industrial style or factory as building type. He said that reinforced concrete had been around for 20 years and this was just a cheap, economic building. He said the building was not owner occupied, single use, large scale, rectilinear floor, adjacent to rail, had no docks or segregated entries. He said Henry Bittman was associated with the building and listed as engineer on the plans but the building was a design-build and not Bittman's. He provided an overview of Bittman's portfolio and said his work was recognized by contemporaries and scholars. He said Bittman began

practicing architecture in 1919. He said that Bittman had a rich and substantial body of work including the Terminal Sales Building, Coliseum Theater, Fraternal Order of Eagles, among others. He said this building has never been mentioned in the news or by scholars. He said this building was way below Bittman's skillset.

He said that the building was not built as designed and the second pilaster didn't extend to the cornice with a cap. He said the Hill Syrup sign was painted across the building which undermines the notion it was an architectural project. He said that the Space Needle and Smith Tower would meet Criterion F but this building is just three stories tall surrounded by taller mid to hi-rise buildings in the neighborhood. He cited Ford Assembly and Firestone as more worthy. He said it is a small site and building and is not prominently sited. He said the design is unremarkable and the building is not known in the neighborhood or City.

John Tess, Heritage Consulting, said that being old does not make a building worthy for designation. He said the building doesn't meet the criteria.

Jessica Clawson said the building doesn't warrant landmark designation; it has no integrity. She said as it exists today it does not rise to level of landmark status. She said it doesn't have to be the Terminal Sales Building or the Firestone or Ford Motor buildings; she noted smaller buildings – 777 Thomas – which had high integrity and were landmarked. She urged the board to vote 'no'.

Ms. Barker asked which other sites had been reviewed besides the Seattle Survey.

Mr. Mawson said they use the Seattle survey frequently and they are familiar with it. He said it is a good source for a starting point. He said the most surveys are just that and they are not the result of exhaustive detailed research and exhaustive analysis.

Ms. Barker said it sounds like you expected this to be but it is not.

Mr. Mawson said they weren't disappointed them but it is typical of an inventory because an inventory is a very large document and it is meant to identify properties; every city has done an inventory. He said it is kind of a stepping stone and sometimes you find that it is a good base and it gives you a place to start. He said they used it and used it as that but they went into the primary sources that you would go into to thoroughly research the property.

Ms. Barker asked if that is typical of the other times they have used it.

Mr. Mawson said in some cases yes.

Ms. Clawson said they weren't trying to trash the survey at all.

Mr. Mawson said it is a good source.

Ms. Clawson said the context of the survey is it was done as part of the South Lake Union rezone EIS so there was City funding done for the survey. She said that consultants were hired to do a survey that says 'what do we think, generally' and then that survey is used by City staff when something comes before them that is on the survey that needs to go to the board. She said at that time the deep research is done.

Ms. Barker said they mentioned the Bogue Plan and asked what parts of the plan were adopted.

Mr. Mawson said he would have to defer to Larry Johnson.

Mr. Johnson said that none of the Bogue Plan was adopted.

Ms. Barker said thank you.

Mr. Johnson said that the Bogue Plan for this area called for a rail station and they left the area where the building exit was for a tangent of that rail station.

Ms. Barker said yes, yes, it is.

Mr. Treffers said that J. T. Hardeman Building was used as a good example; he asked Mr. Mawson to explain why.

Mr. Mawson said it is rectilinear square, four stories, has more articulation, has character of factory building with more access on the back side.

Mr. Treffers asked if the Hardeman building has floor to ceiling windows.

Mr. Mawson said no, you rarely get absolute floor to ceiling windows.

Mr. Tess said it isn't typical.

Mr. Treffers said that it looks fairly similar to this building.

Mr. Mawson said the windows provide light and ventilation and are standard window sizes.

Mr. Treffers noted the cornice and articulation and said the building looks like something.

Ms. Durham asked if the windows on the Hardeman are original.

Mr. Mawson said 'no'.

Mr. Coney said this is one of the first industrial buildings in the area.

Mr. Mawson said to define 'one of the first' and said it wasn't the first and it wasn't the last.

Larry Johnson said the first industrial building was the Shell Plant. In 1919-20 there were at least six factory buildings built there; one had a rail spur and tower. The said that three exist today.

Mr. Tess said that just because it is old doesn't mean it is historic. He said Boyd's name isn't on the building and the building was built quickly. He said it is an infill building.

Mr. Johnson said the shoreline was platted in 1919-20; properties became available for sale about that time.

Mr. Treffers asked about the south wall being replaced with CMU. He said the nomination report noted 1958 fire damage and the whole wall was replaced.

Mr. Johnson said it is all modern and you can tell the age from visual observation.

Ms. Clawson said the property owner said it is CMU. She said an article mentions the 1958 fire but doesn't say where it was.

Mr. Johnson said the real Boyd building burned to the ground; the original terracotta tile would have been damaged.

Ms. Clawson said the Seattle Times noted water damage to property to the north.

Ms. Barker asked if the wall could have been changed out in the 1940s.

Mr. Treffers asked if it was a parti-wall.

Mr. Johnson said he can only speculate. He said that Boyd overextended himself and dumped the building. He said maybe he planned windows on the south but it never had them. He said at the sale of the property Boyd plan a new building.

Mr. Treffers said the original plan show the building constructed with current footprint. He asked if the wall was parti-wall as constructed.

Mr. Tess said the floors didn't line up.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the structural system.

Mr. Johnson said it is heavy timber – timber posts and heavy beams and noted the wood was nice.

Mr. Sneddon said Bittman could have done this in his sleep, why hire an engineer.

Mr. Tess said Bittman knew Boyd and maybe they were friends.

Mr. Mawson said that Hurley Mason needed a local representative.

Mr. Johnson said Hurley Mason was not well-established and had no drafting department so they used Bittman to apply for permit.

Mr. Sneddon asked how they assessed the building has no importance to the local community under Criterion F.

Mr. Mawson said the criteria is straightforward and it should be prominently sites and adds character to the neighborhood. He said it is a value judgment. He said the Criterion is a catch-all, if the building doesn't meet other criteria.

Mr. Tess said that Firestone has a presence.

Mr. Sneddon said that Messrs. Mawson and Tess are coming from a different city.

Ms. Barker said they should talk to the community.

Mr. Tess said that Mr. Johnson is on the team.

Mr. Sneddon asked how they ascertained local significance.

Ms. Clawson said they have Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Ketcherside said he is trying to understand the presentation today.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, provided a letter / email (in DON file) and spoke in support of designation. She said this building qualifies. She said the



windows were removed last year – not years ago. She said that size doesn't matter. She said she is tired of seeing this going on; she said she wouldn't go into the windows and said that we all know the potential real story. She said the building meets criteria C and D. She submitted additional photos and history. She noted the Bogue Plan and said she has the 1911 plan.

Joe Herrin did not support designation. He said it is a banal background building that doesn't take advantage of the site.

Michael Herschensohn, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported designation. He said that size is not critical. He said he was overwhelmed – scholarly and irrelevant. Albert Kahn – Space Needle to obscure. He said this is a building in our neighborhood that is prominent and tells a significant piece of history. He said the land was filled and the shore defined. He said there are good reasons to designate.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, said the Boyd home is on Queen Anne; he built it in 1920. She said that Loveless designed the home. Boyd lived there and didn't have to sell it.

Marv Anderson said that the report on Bittman cited by Mr. Mawson did not come from him, it came from staff. He said that before 1919 Bittman was an engineer; in 1919, he started building – this was a break out year for him. He said that the building is consistent with the drawing sets. His name is on the drawing as engineer. In 1920, he was an architect.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Johnson did not support designation. She said there is a place for utilitarian buildings. She said the windows are gone. She said a lot of windows were removed from the Maritime Building but that it reflected its place more than this building. She said there isn't enough left.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation.

C – actual local history of development not mentioned. Platting and development as commercial industrial – in first wave of that real estate, transportation. Especially this type of building – railroad and maritime – how it didn't meet. Commercial warehouse loft – versus factory type.

D – timber framed in this era when going to concrete and steel. Industrial steel sash window. not outstanding but interesting – part of Bittman portfolio.

F – not just stands out. Age, scale, contrast in community, not larger city.

Yes – unusual commercial warehouse type. Take issue that need original materials to have integrity – plenty of national buildings without historic materials. Integrity not first. Loss of windows is unfortunate but it can still convey significance as type – commercial loft.

Ms. Vyhnanek agreed with Mr. Sneddon. She supported designation and said that Criterion D was most applicable. She appreciated receiving supplemental materials and public comment. She said a lot of that was missing in the presentation. She said size of windows are not regular size – the openings are significant. She said the trapezoidal structure is significant example of style.

Mr. Ketcherside said that at least new information should be presented in a format that is supplied to the Board in advance. Otherwise, no ability to ponder, reflect. He said there were gaps, mis-statements, departures from procedure or local law. And a different consultant was used for nomination and designation.

He supported designation on Criterion D. He said prior discussion – he supported Criterion C – period of development of the ship canal and locks wasn't addressed. He noted stagnation because of the war, investment of property and development. Representative loft building. Maybe in other cities there are more – here we have odd topography. The trapezoidal shows adapted type to space. It wasn't super fancy. What remains still conveys cross hatch appearance.

*Mr. Sneddon left at 5:30 pm.*

Ms. Patterson said the presentation today was completely different.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation and noted Criterion D. He said it is an industrial work loft. He said that Mr. Sneddon made a nice case. He said that this was an interesting time in Bittman's career – from sales, to engineer, to architect.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C and D. She said you get a lot of great stories here. She said she hoped the presenters learned some stories that Seattle has to share. She said that – internal – and how Seattle was made and grew – it is our own history. She said this site – a few years before – was under water. She said they took advantage of what was coming. She said the building is still here. She said the building is bisected by the street, tucked into the hill. It benefitted from the economic heritage of the area. She hoped they learned something.

Ms. Durham noted a hard time deciding if it is significant as a landmark or just as an old building. She said there wasn't enough to meet the double

significance of Criterion C. She said that it still has the characteristics as work lofts. She noted the misdirected direction of the presentation.

Mr. Coney supported designation and said it conveys what it is without the windows. He said you can see it is historic. He supported Criterion D for method of construction and period. He said it is a hybrid concrete exterior, wood interior which was unique at that time. He said it is possibly the first one Bittman design as an architect, which adds to the story. He said that it is in a prominent location even by those who don't want it nominated. He noted Criterion F says "...make it prominent in the neighborhood or city." He said it embodies – one of the early buildings in the area. It was sited there for a reason. He noted the access to rail and water. He said it meets Criterion C and is an aspect of how the area was developed. It ties in with other buildings in the area – the Armory, Ford Assembly, and others. He said from Lake Union you see it. He said the AGC building, mentioned by presenters, was a mistake of its time.

Mr. Treffers said he supported Criterion D. he said he agreed with comments made by Messrs. Sneddon and Ketcherside. He said it is frustrating to have to digest new information on the spot. He said it benefits the ability to digest if the story deviates or if there is a case to be made. He said language in Criterion D says "embodies visual characteristics...". He said the removal of the windows is unfortunate – they were a primary feature, but framing, board-formed concrete, features are still there. He said we see the same features here as provided in buildings that were held up as better. He said it only needs to meet one criterion. Regarding Criterion D it characterizes industrial development of the neighborhood – it is echoed in all materials. He said not maritime, not rail, but industrial got skipped over. The building embodies what was going on in the neighborhood. It is not an outstanding example of Bittman – it is ordinary vernacular. He was a smart designer who designed to needs of his occupants. The building was built for its function; it fit the constraints of the site.

Ms. Patterson said that the integrity is not just material and ornament. She said removal of the windows is a deal breaker for her. She said it would be naïve to say the window removal was innocent and she expressed frustration with a process where people can rip off terracotta or windows.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation. He is not sure the window removal was so innocent; he said it was not a repair. He said the bar needed to be higher for a plain building and it should embody vernacular. He said this is not a big piece in Bittman's portfolio.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Frederick Boyd Co. Building/American Meter & Appliance Building at 1001 – 1005 Westlake Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that

the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/RK/EV 6:4:0 Motion carried. Mmes. Durham, Patterson, and Johnson, and Mr. Kiel opposed.

The following items were reviewed out of agenda order.

**050317.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

050317.51 Crescent-Hamm Building  
4302 SW Alaska Way / 4559 California Avenue SW

Ms. Doherty explained the Controls and Incentives Agreement was signed and read through the agreement.

Public Comment:

Clay Eals, Southwest Seattle Historical Society, supported the agreement and said the incentives will be helpful for owners as they would now be eligible for grants.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives document for the Crescent-Hamm Building, 4302 SW Alaska Way, 4559 California Avenue SW.

MM/SC/RK/DB 10:0:0 Motion carried.

**050317.4 NOMINATION**

050317.41 Rodgers Tile Company Building  
117 Yale Avenue North

David Peterson, NK Architects, provided context of the site and neighborhood. He said that the building was built in 1917 with addition constructed in 1921. He said there are no permits on file, or drawings for the addition. He explained the neighborhood developed around water and rail transportation in the 1800s. he said the area is associated with immigrants and the working class. He said there was a prominent lumber mill, breweries and manufacturing; there were low scale working class houses and small ethnic churches. He said the building is on the site of the Rhyther Children's Home which occupied the original mansion. He reported that in the 1930s the area became more industrialized. He said the north part of the building is part of one of the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph company's buildings; it was purchased by Charles Rodgers in 1927 along with the lot next door. Mr. Rodgers constructed the second part of the building.

Rodgers was from Ohio, home of important pottery manufacturing and perhaps there is some connection there. He said that He sold tile, marble, and terrazzo for

the Smith Tower project and also provided tile for apartment buildings – art tiles, tile surrounds, fireplaces in residential market. He said that Rodgers built the addition and applied tile decoration to both portions. He said that industrial uses and product storage for building trades took advantage of the easy access to rail and water transportation.

Mr. Peterson said the exterior tiles were colorful Malibu tiles. Malibu Tiles was founded in the early 1920s when high quality clay was discovered while drilling for oil in Malibu, California. Property owner May Rindge developed the hand painted tile in Saracen or Moorish design. Malibu Tile operated from 1927 – 1931 when the building was destroyed by fire and was never rebuilt. Malibu Tile was one of the tile lines Rodgers represented; he supplied the tile for the Piedmont Apartments (Tuscany Apartments) in Seattle.

He said that the Ivey building was a simple Beaux Arts with Roman and classical proportions. He said that Spanish Colonial Revival was popular at the time. He said that this building has the proportions of Italian Renaissance Revival and Eclectic Commercial. Rodgers Tile operated until 1940 when the business closed. After Rodgers Tile closed various tenants occupied the building over time and changes were made to accommodate them. Significant alterations took place in 1942 by architect Andrew Willatsen for new owner, Hall-Scott Motor Car. Lots of material was removed: tile, frieze, lattice work, double arch doorway, panel plaque above door, and odd screen insert were removed and re-plastering was done.

Nicolai and Berthe Kuvshinoff lived in the upstairs apartment a couple times. They were artists who lived in Paris for some time and when they came back they again occupied the apartment. Kuvshinoff was from Siberia and his father, Vasily, served the nearby St. Spiridon Church. He said that the Kuvshinoff produced an enormous amount of work which, according to David Martin, local gallery owner, was not significant and had no effect on the local art scene.

Mr. Peterson said the building is unreinforced masonry over concrete with post and beam construction, roof supported by truss in 1917 building and in 1927 building, exposed beams. The second level apartment is still there. Siding on the alley side was added in 1996 and is not covered in extensive graffiti. The garage entry door with transom is a recent addition. He said the main elevation is on the east. He said that since 1996 the roof has been patched, the building has been replastered, all windows have been replaced. He said that upper portion of the arched windows has the original leaded glass. He said the band at top was tile and was gone in 1943 as were the sills. He said that below the main entry are tile cut outs for venting. He said that tile at the header was replaced with similar, molding cresting was removed, black tile was replaced, and ten field tiles were replaced. He said that the original tile walk off in the vestibule is still there.

He said that comparable buildings in the area include 320 Terry, Pioneer Sand and Gravel, David Smith building, Frederick Boyd and OB Williams buildings. He said there has been much loss of integrity; the tile was an important part of that and much is gone.

Owner John Ahlers said he bought the building in 1986 and was pretty run down when he purchased it. He went over changes that he has made: lower section roof, all windows except for arched leaded portion, roof tile. He said that Kuvshinoffs wanted to move back in and he let them. He said they paid no rent but he let them stay because no one else wanted to move in.

Jack McCullough said not to nominate; the entire original building has been stripped of ornamentation. He said some of the remaining tile is Malibu, and some is replacement.

Ms. Durham asked about the 1927 roof.

Mr. Ahlers said that it was tile but when they did repair, they salvaged where they could and the rest is a composition roof.

Mr. Coney asked about stucco work.

Mr. Ahlers said they back part has siding – they couldn't salvage the stucco. He said the front is gypsum sheetrock where there was water damage; it was painted with elastomeric paint.

Ms. Patterson asked if Elizabeth Ayer worked with Ivey.

Mr. Peterson said that he had an established practice at this time. He said that she did work with him later but he wasn't sure about this time.

Mr. Treffers asked about Kellogg Tile distribution and if there are other extant buildings associated with that.

Mr. Peterson said that Kellogg Tile might have been in the Simpson Building and Rodgers operated in the Maritime Building.

Mr. Treffers asked if Kellogg, or anyone else, was selling Malibu Tile.

Mr. Peterson said he didn't know but noted an article about Rodgers, who really pushed fireplaces, especially Batchelder. He said that Kellogg carried higher end tile that no one else carried. He said he thought that Rodgers was the only one who carried Malibu. He said that Kellogg had a larger office and was connected to art tiles.

Ms. Barker asked what Willatsen had to do to remove the tile.

Mr. Peterson said that Malibu, Catalina, or Kraft tiles are difficult to remove without destroying them; they are put on a plaster backing so it is set in. He said terracotta is installed in larger units with steel tie and grout and is easier to remove.

Mr. Treffers asked changed openings.

Mr. Ahlers said that there are windows above now that didn't exist in 1942.

Ms. Patterson said Rodgers move to this building was ambitious at this time. She asked when the use of tiles peaked.

Mr. Peterson said that sales of basic normal tile didn't slow down but that the colorful tiles were popular in the 1920s with the revival styles; Spanish Colonial Revival was popular.

Mr. Coney asked if Rodgers was exclusive dealer in Malibu Tile and asked if there was any connection to ceramicist Rufus Keeler.

Mr. Peterson said he didn't know about Keeler.

Mr. Treffers said Mr. Peterson said the building is not eligible for nomination because it has no integrity. He asked about significant association with Malibu.

Mr. Peterson said that it did not come up. He said that Rodgers was one of a handful of tile and terrazzo dealers; Malibu was not the only thing he did. He said that Kellogg was his chief competitor.

Public Comment:

Larry Kreisman, Historic Seattle, said there are other considerations besides integrity and noted legacy buildings and businesses that have a broader impact. He said that Kellogg was an artist and craftsperson; his showroom was beautiful and artist-designed. Rodgers was a marketer, businessman, distributor with tie into companies like Malibu. He said that Keeler was a leading light for Malibu. He noted a home in Broadmoor with Malibu tiles that William Bain and Lionel Pries worked on. He said the story is equally important. He said this is the only extant building representing the tile distribution marketing approach. He said it influenced architects, designers, and the developer of Smith Tower. He said that without Kellogg and Rodgers you wouldn't have Batchelder tile in houses, a showroom covered in Malibu tile as advertisement. He said that the building retains significant integrity to convey what it did. He noted the connection to Seattle's architectural growth. He said the building meets criteria C and D. He noted the connection to Malibu potters and to the M. V. Malibu which was the Rindge yacht and a Seattle landmark.

Mr. Ketcherside said he supported nomination to take a closer look to see the building's condition. He said it was a great report and comments and said the double significance for Criterion C is there. He noted Criterion D for Eclectic Revival.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and noted criteria C, and F. She said it is visible and iconic and helps to tell a story that common folk could have beauty in their home. She wanted to know if there is any connection with Craftsman or Bungalow homes.

Mr. Treffers supported nomination on criteria C, and D and said it meets the double significance in that it was an important company in residential and commercial development of the City. He said it is significant for Malibu Tile regionally and nationally and tells an important story of architecture in the 1920s. He said he appreciated the report. He said the Kuvshinoffs did not rise to any level of significance. He said there is enough there to convey its Spanish Colonial style and its significance. He suggested including the vestibule and said the rest of the interior was altered.

Mr. Coney supported nomination and noted criteria C, D, and F. He said that Rodgers built it for his business and there is enough there that warrants moving on in the process. He said the building is an identifiable feature. He noted only one of two buildings have ornamentation.

Mr. Hodgins supported nomination and noted criteria C and D. He said he built the showroom and that remains.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination on criteria C and D. She said the report was well-researched and fun to read.

Ms. Johnson said the report was interesting to read. She did not support nomination.

Mr. Kiel said it did not meet double significance and that Malibu Tile is not significant to Seattle.

Ms. Barker said that not everybody got to California and this is what they knew – this element was bright and new and have a place to go and see the tile was different.

Ms. Johnson said if more tile remained she might have supported.

Mr. Kiel said he wouldn't support.



Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Rodgers Tile Company Building at 117 Yale Avenue North 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 and the vestibule; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 7, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/ST/DB      6:2:0    Motion carried. Mr. Kiel and Ms. Johnson opposed.

**050317.6      STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator