Washington State
Department of Transportation
Paula J. Hammond, P.E.
Secretary of Transportation

Engineering and Regional Operations
SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program
600 Stewart Street, Suite 520
Seattle, WA 98101

Phone: 206-770-3500
Fax: 206-770-3569
TTY: 1-800-833-6388
www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge

August 12, 2010

RE: SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement Project and HOV Project Consulting Party Participation and Revised Area of Potential Effects (APE)

Dear

Per provisions of 36 CFR Part 800, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is undertaking an identified transportation need in Seattle, King County, Washington. The SR 520 bridges are vulnerable to earthquakes and windstorms and must be replaced. The Bridge Replacement and HOV Project will replace the SR 520 bridges, and include other transit, HOV and community enhancements. Pursuant to compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), namely, provisions in 36 CFR 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i) regarding consulting parties, we are consulting with the City of Olympia, a Certified Local Government (CLG), about the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. This letter requests two actions on your part. One, to consider and acknowledge your interest in participating as a consulting party to the subject project. Two, to review and comment as appropriate upon the revise Area of Potential Affect (APE).

The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project is one component of the SR 520 Program. The other projects within the program are: SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project, Pontoon Construction Project, and Lake Washington Urban Partnership. The project described in this letter extends from the SR 520 interchange with I-5 to 92nd Avenue NE in Yarrow Point. The project would tie in to the Eastside Transit and HOV

Project at Evergreen Point Road; restriping would occur from Evergreen Point Road to 92nd Avenue NE.

Project Description

A Draft EIS published in August 2006 evaluated No Build, 4-Lane, and 6-Lane alternatives for the SR 520 corridor. In January 2010 a Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) evaluated a 6-Lane Alternative, a No Build Alternative, and three design options for the 6-Lane Alternative in Seattle that were developed by a mediation group in 2007 and 2008. The two alternatives and three design options of the SDEIS would rebuild SR 520 between I-5 and Medina, including replacement of the Evergreen Point Bridge across Lake Washington. Upon consideration of public, agency and tribal comments on the alternatives and design options analyzed in the SDEIS, FHWA and WSDOT selected a preferred alternative in April 2010 with the following elements:

- A new six-lane corridor from I-5 to Medina that includes two general-purpose and one transit/HOV lane in each direction.
- Reversible transit/HOV ramp to the I-5 express lanes; headed from the Eastside to downtown Seattle in the morning and from downtown Seattle to the Eastside in the evening.
- A six-lane Portage Bay Bridge with a westbound managed shoulder.
- An urban interchange at Montlake Boulevard.
- A second bascule bridge across the Montlake Cut that provides additional capacity for transit/HOV, bicycles and pedestrians.
- A space between the west approach bridge structures that could accommodate potential future light rail and connect to the University Link light rail station.
- A 14-foot-wide bicycle/pedestrian path across Lake Washington.
- Environmental improvements, including noise reduction features, stormwater treatment, removal of unused R.H. Thomson ramps to restore park land and habitats, and improvements for fish and wetlands plants.

More details about the preferred alternative and the project are available on the Program's webpage: www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge.

Consulting Party Role

Your participation as a consulting party is invited because the City of Olympia has may have a particular interest in the project's potential adverse effects on archaeological and historic properties as defined by Section 106. The consultation process should encourage creativity and a common-sense approach to problem solving. Further, Section 106:

- Is a process and discussion.
- Does not necessarily result in preservation.
- Seeks to integrate consideration of historic preservation in balancing a full range of public values.

Consulting party status entitles your organization to weigh in on aspects of this project that would potentially affect historic properties, or those resources that are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. As a consulting party, your organization would have the opportunity to comment on amendments to the Area of

Potential Effects (APE), identification of historic properties within the APE, and the determination of adverse effects to historic properties. Further, you would be invited to participate in developing measures to mitigate adverse effects to historic properties, if any are necessary.

Your organization would have an opportunity to receive and review pertinent information, offer ideas, and consider possible solutions together with WSDOT and other consulting parties. Review periods for Section 106 consulting parties are not specifically established in the regulations. However, the SHPO and tribes are allotted a **30 day review period**, and WSDOT plans to follow this protocol for all consulting parties whenever we are able. Please note that Section 106 consulting party status deals specifically with historic properties: those buildings, structures, objects, sites, and districts that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Currently, the next step in the Section 106 process is a series of individual consulting party organizations meetings with two consultants to the state, Terry Klein and Lynne Sebastian, PhD of the SRI Foundation during July and August 2010. At these meetings Mr. Klein and Dr. Sebastian will work with your organization to identify concerns about specific effects on the integrity of historic properties that could result from construction and operation of the SR 520 project. This information will be compiled and provided to WSDOT project staff to help inform the WSDOT/FHWA decision about the effects of this project on archaeological and historic properties.

If the city of Olympia accepts the invitation to become a Consulting Party under Section 106, **please return your response using the attached form by August 23, 2010**. We will then contact you to arrange a meeting or telephone conference at your convenience.

Revised Area of Potential Effects (APE)

Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(c)(1), the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is continuing consultation for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. Thank you for your ongoing participation and interest in this project. Please see the enclosed map, which illustrates the revised Area of Potential Effects (APE) for this project. T he APE has been expanded to incorporate two, non-contiguous construction staging sites that would be used to construct supplemental stability pontoons for the new Evergreen Point Bridge. One site will be at the Port of Olympia and the other will be at the Port of Tacoma, encompassing the Concrete Tech Company (CTC) property as well as an area across the street from CTC to the southwest.

The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project is planning to replace the Evergreen Point Bridge with a new 6-lane bridge, which will require 77 total pontoons. As acknowledged in the January 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS, the I-5 to Medina project plans to use the 33 pontoons constructed by the Pontoon Construction Project for independent catastrophic failure planning, and construct an additional 44 supplemental stability pontoons in order to provide the buoyancy necessary for a new 6-lane bridge. These 44 pontoons are not part of catastrophic failure planning and are only necessary for the 6-lane replacement

enable pontoon construction. The vertical APE for these sites will extend to the depth of ground disturbance, which includes pile driving. WSDOT will transport the pontoons on existing roadways from those upland sites to the launch sites.

WSDOT will conduct a survey and inventory of all historic (pre-1972) resources within the revised APE. These locations are privately owned, so the archaeological identification efforts as well as potential evaluation efforts at these sites will be conducted as part of a Programmatic Agreement for the project.

Thank you for your time and attention to this project. We look forward to your comments on the revised APE. **We would appreciate an expedited review of the revised APE, and hope to receive any comments by August 23.** If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact:
Archaeologist - Kevin Bartoy at 206-521-5628, email bartoyK@wsdot.wa.gov
Environmental Lead - Marsha Tolon, at 206-521-5571, email tolonm@wsdot.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

Julie Meredith

Julie Meredith, P.E.
SR 520 Program Director

Enclosures

Cc: Jennifer Kenny, Olympia Heritage Commission
Matthew Sterner, DAHP
Randy Everett, FHWA
Kevin Bartoy, WSDOT
Marsha Tolon, WSDOT

SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
Section 106 Consulting Party Designation

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), invites the City of Olympia to participate in Section 106 consultation for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project per 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i).

The consultation process, if approached in good faith, should encourage creativity and a common-sense approach to problem solving. As a process and discussion avenue, Section 106 seeks to integrate consideration of historic preservation in balancing a full range of public values, though it does not necessarily result in preservation.

Consulting party points of involvement per Section 106 regulations include:

1. Area of Potential Affects (APE) establishment
2. Historic Property identification
3. During and at determination of effect(s)
4. In case of SHPO/THPO (Tribal Historic Preservation Officer) objection
5. During mitigation measures development

Please circle your response and sign as indicated.

We, the City of Olympia, **accept / decline** to participate in Section 106 consultation for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project per 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i).

_____	_____
Signature	*Date*
_____	_____
Print Name	*Print Title*

Comment:

Copies of the following letter were sent to the following individuals:				
Date	**Subject**	**From**	**To**	**Corresp. Ref. No.**
8/18/2010	SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project, Seattle, King County, Section 106 Consulting Party Process	Marsha Tolon Environmental Lead WSDOT	Nancy Brainard North Capitol Hill Neighborhood Association 2419 Federal Ave E Seattle, WA 98102	LTR #1583

Washington State
Department of Transportation
Paula J. Hammond, P.E.
Secretary of Transportation

Engineering and Regional Operations
SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program
600 Stewart Street, Suite 520
Seattle, WA 98101

Phone: 206-770-3500
Fax: 206-770-3569
TTY: 1-800-833-6388
www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge

August 18, 2010

Y-8393 BH
LTR #1583

Nancy Brainard, Secretary
North Capitol Hill Neighborhood Association
2419 Federal Ave. E.
Seattle, WA 98102

RE: SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
Section 106 Consulting Party Process

Dear Ms. Brainard:

Thank you for your participation in the Section 106 Consulting Party process for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project.

On Friday, August 13, you received an orientation phone call from Lynne Sebastian with the SRI Foundation. You have also received an e-mail from Lynne with the following materials:

- Section 106 consultation plan / schedule
- Haul routes map
- Explanation of criteria for evaluating a property's integrity

We have enclosed the following additional materials for your reference:

- List of invited Consulting Parties
- Primer on the role of Consulting Parties in the Section 106 process
- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) brochure on Consulting Party participation in the Section 106 process
- Maps of the area of potential effects (APE)
- Section 106 process flowchart graphic
- Map of the Preferred Alternative
- Supplemental draft environmental impact statement (EIS) executive summary (includes a copy of the supplemental draft EIS and discipline reports on compact disc).

We recommend referencing the following documents and chapters:

- Cultural Resources Discipline Report
- SDEIS Chapter 3 (Construction Effects section)
- SDEIS Chapter 4 (beginning on p. 4-40)
- SDEIS Chapter 5 (beginning on p. 5-82)
- SDEIS Chapter 6 (beginning on p. 6-57)
- SDEIS Chapter 7 (entire chapter)

If you have any questions about these materials or if there is anything else we can provide to help you understand your organization's role in the Consulting Party process, do not hesitate to contact me at tolonm@wsdot.wa.gov or by phone at 206.770.3573.

Sincerely,

Marsha Tolon

Marsha Tolon
WSDOT Environmental Lead

Enclosures

cc: Jenifer Young, SR 520 Environmental Manager
Lori Durio, SR 520 Cultural Resources Lead

Copies of the following letter were sent to the following individuals:				
Date	**Subject**	**From**	**To**	**Corresp. Ref. No.**
8/25/2010	SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project, Seattle, King County, Haul Route Historic Property Inventory Forms	Marsha Tolon SR 520 Program Environmental Lead WSDOT	Erin O'Conner 2312 10th Ave E Seattle, WA 98102	LTR #1589

Washington State Department of Transportation
Paula J. Hammond, P.E.
Secretary of Transportation

Engineering and Regional Operations
SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program
600 Stewart Street, Suite 520
Seattle, WA 98101

Phone: 206-770-3500
Fax: 206-770-3569
TTY: 1-800-833-6388
www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge

August 25, 2010

Y-8393 BH
LTR #1589

Erin O'Conner
2612 10th Avenue East
Seattle, WA 98102

RE: SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
Haul Route Historic Property Inventory forms

Dear Erin,

We appreciate the time and work you are dedicating to this project as a consulting party. By this letter, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is continuing Section 106 consultation per the provisions of 36 CFR Part 800.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for this project was expanded in response to comments and concerns raised by our Section 106 consulting parties and following multiple conversations with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The revised APE now includes all potential construction haul routes and potential park mitigation sites for Section 6(f) compliance. The SHPO agreed with this revised APE on August 17, 2010.

Within the areas captured by the expanded APE, WSDOT conducted a survey and inventory of all historic (pre-1972) resources not already surveyed, which totaled 355 properties. This survey was submitted electronically to SHPO on August 19 through the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's (DAHP) new Historic Property Inventory (HPI) web-based system. Due to some technical challenges with the new system, it is not yet possible to print the entire survey. WSDOT has printed each HPI form separately and then combined them to provide the complete survey electronically for viewing. Per your request, please enclosed find a CD that contains an Adobe.pdf file for all 355 HPI forms. As previously agreed with DAHP staff, the review period for these determinations of National Register eligibility is limited and will conclude on September 9, 2010. To assist with your

review, we have also included a table that lists the addresses of all properties surveyed and their eligibility determination.

Thank you again for your time and attention to this project. We look forward to continuing consultation with you on this project, and to your comments on the HPI forms. **We appreciate receipt of any comments on the HPI forms by Thursday, September 9, 2010.** If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 206-770-3573, or by email at tolonm@wsdot.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

Marsha Tolon

Marsha Tolon
WSDOT Environmental Lead
SR 520 Program

cc: Randy Everett, FHWA
Matthew Sterner, DAHP
Jenifer Young, WSDOT

Copies of the following letter were sent to the following individuals:				
Date	**Subject**	**From**	**To**	**Corresp. Ref. No.**
9/20/2010	SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project, Seattle, King County, Consulting Party Participation and Revised Area of Potential Effects	Julie Meredith SR 520 Program Director WSDOT	John Wolfe Port of Tacoma P.O. Box 1837 Tacoma, WA 98401 Reuben McKnight The City of Tacoma 747 Market St, Room 1036 Tacoma, WA 98402-3793	LTR #1070 LTR #1071

Washington State
Department of Transportation
Paula J. Hammond, P.E.
Secretary of Transportation

Engineering and Regional Operations
SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program
600 Stewart Street, Suite 520
Seattle, WA 98101

Phone: 206-770-3500
Fax: 206-770-3569
TTY: 1-800-833-6388
www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge

September 20, 2010

RE: SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
Consulting Party Participation and Revised Area of Potential Effects (APE)

Dear

Pursuant to compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), namely, provisions in 36 CFR 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i) regarding consulting parties, we are consulting with the City of Tacoma about the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. This letter requests two actions on your part. One, to consider and acknowledge your interest in participating as a consulting party to the subject project. Two, to review and comment as appropriate upon the revised Area of Potential Effects (APE). Please see the enclosed map, which illustrates the revised APE for this project. The APE has been expanded to incorporate two, non-contiguous construction staging sites that would be used to construct supplemental stability pontoons for the new Evergreen Point Bridge. One site will be at the Port of Olympia and the other will be at the Port of Tacoma, encompassing the Concrete Tech Company (CTC) property as well as an area across the street from CTC to the southwest.

The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project is planning to replace the Evergreen Point Bridge with a new 6-lane bridge, which will require 77 total pontoons. As acknowledged in the January 2010 Supplemental Draft EIS, the I-5 to Medina project plans to use the 33 pontoons constructed by the Pontoon Construction Project for independent catastrophic failure planning, and construct an additional 44 supplemental stability pontoons in order to provide the buoyancy necessary for a new 6-lane bridge. These 44 pontoons are not part of catastrophic failure planning and are only necessary for the 6-lane replacement bridge as identified in the I-5 to Medina project. FHWA has concurred with WSDOT's

approach to the independent analysis of the I-5 to Medina Project and the Pontoon Construction Project. The inclusion of Port of Olympia and Port of Tacoma sites would allow WSDOT to meet the project delivery schedule.

WSDOT will not construct new casting basins or other production facilities at these construction staging sites. However, WSDOT will be grading, paving, and performing pile driving to build strong foundation slabs at two existing upland industrial facilities to enable pontoon construction. The vertical APE for these sites will extend to the depth of ground disturbance, which includes pile driving. WSDOT will transport the pontoons on existing roadways from those upland sites to the launch sites.

WSDOT will conduct a survey and inventory of all historic (pre-1972) resources within the revised APE. These locations are privately owned, so the archaeological identification efforts as well as potential evaluation efforts at these sites will be conducted as part of a Programmatic Agreement for the project.

The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project is one component of the SR 520 Program. The other projects within the program are: SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project, Pontoon Construction Project, and Lake Washington Urban Partnership. The project described in this letter extends from the SR 520 interchange with I-5 to 92nd Avenue NE in Yarrow Point. The project would tie in to the Eastside Transit and HOV Project at Evergreen Point Road; restriping would occur from Evergreen Point Road to 92nd Avenue NE.

Project Description

A Draft EIS published in August 2006 evaluated No Build, 4-Lane, and 6-Lane alternatives for the SR 520 corridor. In January 2010 a Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) evaluated a 6-Lane Alternative, a No Build Alternative, and three design options for the 6-Lane Alternative in Seattle that were developed by a mediation group in 2007 and 2008. The two alternatives and three design options of the SDEIS would rebuild SR 520 between I-5 and Medina, including replacement of the Evergreen Point Bridge across Lake Washington. Upon consideration of public, agency and tribal comments on the alternatives and design options analyzed in the SDEIS, FHWA and WSDOT selected a preferred alternative in April 2010 with the following elements:

- A new six-lane corridor from I-5 to Medina that includes two general-purpose and one transit/HOV lane in each direction.
- Reversible transit/HOV ramp to the I-5 express lanes; headed from the Eastside to downtown Seattle in the morning and from downtown Seattle to the Eastside in the evening.
- A six-lane Portage Bay Bridge with a westbound managed shoulder.
- An urban interchange at Montlake Boulevard.
- A second bascule bridge across the Montlake Cut that provides additional capacity for transit/HOV, bicycles and pedestrians.
- A space between the west approach bridge structures that could accommodate potential future light rail and connect to the University Link light rail station.
- A 14-foot-wide bicycle/pedestrian path across Lake Washington.

- Environmental improvements, including noise reduction features, stormwater treatment, removal of unused R.H. Thomson ramps to restore park land and habitats, and improvements for fish and wetlands plants.

More details about the preferred alternative and the project are available on the Program's webpage: www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge.

Consulting Party Role

Your participation as a consulting party is invited because the City of Tacoma may have a particular interest in the project's potential adverse effects on archaeological and historic properties as defined by Section 106. The consultation process should encourage creativity and a common-sense approach to problem solving. Further, Section 106:

- Is a process and discussion.
- Does not necessarily result in preservation.
- Seeks to integrate consideration of historic preservation in balancing a full range of public values.

Consulting party status entitles your organization to weigh in on aspects of this project that would potentially affect historic properties, or those resources that are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. As a consulting party, your organization would have the opportunity to comment on amendments to the Area of Potential Effects (APE), identification of historic properties within the APE, and the determination of adverse effects to historic properties. Further, you would be invited to participate in developing measures to mitigate adverse effects to historic properties, if any are necessary.

Your organization would have an opportunity to receive and review pertinent information, offer ideas, and consider possible solutions together with WSDOT and other consulting parties. Review periods for Section 106 consulting parties are not specifically established in the regulations. However, the SHPO and tribes are allotted a **30 day review period**, and WSDOT plans to follow this protocol for all consulting parties whenever we are able. Please note that Section 106 consulting party status deals specifically with historic properties: those buildings, structures, objects, sites, and districts that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Currently, the next step in the Section 106 process is a series of individual consulting party organizations meetings with two consultants to the state, Terry Klein and Lynne Sebastian, PhD of the SRI Foundation in September 2010. At these meetings Mr. Klein and Dr. Sebastian will work with your organization to identify concerns about specific effects on the integrity of historic properties that could result from construction and operation of the SR 520 project. This information will be compiled and provided to WSDOT project staff to help inform the WSDOT/FHWA decision about the effects of this project on archaeological and historic properties.

If the City of Tacoma accepts the invitation to become a Consulting Party under Section 106, **please return your response using the attached form by September 30, 2010**.

We will then contact you to arrange a meeting or telephone conference at your convenience.

If you do accept this invitation, we also look forward to your comments on the revised APE. **We would appreciate an expedited review of the revised APE, and hope to receive any comments by September 30.** If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Archaeologist Kevin Bartoy at 206-521-5628, email bartoyK@wsdot.wa.gov Environmental Lead Marsha Tolon, at 206-521-5571, email tolonm@wsdot.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

Julie Meredith

Julie Meredith
SR 520 Program Director

Enclosures

Cc: Matthew Sterner, DAHP
Randy Everett, FHWA
Kevin Bartoy, WSDOT
Marsha Tolon, WSDOT

SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
Section 106 Consulting Party Designation

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), invites the City of Tacoma to participate in Section 106 consultation for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project per 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i).

The consultation process, if approached in good faith, should encourage creativity and a common-sense approach to problem solving. As a process and discussion avenue, Section 106 seeks to integrate consideration of historic preservation in balancing a full range of public values, though it does not necessarily result in preservation.

Consulting party points of involvement per Section 106 regulations include:

1. Area of Potential Effects (APE) establishment
2. Historic Property identification
3. During determination of effect(s)
4. In case of SHPO/THPO (Tribal Historic Preservation Officer) objection
5. During mitigation measures development

Please circle your response and sign as indicated.

We, the City of Tacoma, **accept / decline** to participate in Section 106 consultation for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project per 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i).

_____	_____
Signature	*Date*
_____	_____
Print Name	*Print Title*

Comment:

King County
Office of Business Relations and Economic Development
Historic Preservation Program
400 Yesler Street, Suite 510 [MS: YES-EX-510]
Seattle, WA 98104
206.205.0700

November 29, 2010

Ms. Lynn Sebastian
SRI Foundation
333 Rio Rancho Drive, Suite 103
Rio Rancho, New Mexico 87124 [sent by electronic mail]

Dear Ms. Sebastian: Lynn

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Cultural Resource Assessment and Discipline Report for the SR520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. The following comments focus on historic landscapes and archaeology, since you should be receiving numerous comments on historic buildings and structures from both area residents and the City of Seattle's Historic Preservation Program. Comments on general issues precede those on individual resources, which are followed by observations on needed clarifications.

General

Rather than defer consideration of mitigation measures to later consultation (7-53 re: Seattle Yacht Club, and many other places), WSDOT should commit to a minimum range of highly probable measures for each property, noting that "mitigation is likely to include one or more of the following measures…" followed by a list tailored to individual properties and impacts.

The phrase "context-sensitive design" is used repeatedly without explanation of the critical characteristics of particular contexts that need to frame any design, let alone good design in a particular location.

Noise walls are mentioned as potential mitigation measures for noise impacts in several areas, but it isn't clear exactly what would be built, whether or not the visual simulations include them, nor how they will affect the experience of passengers traversing the existing historic bridge. Noise walls should be described and illustrated in this chapter or appropriate discussion referenced from other chapter(s).

The following reports should be included in the attachments:

- Schneyder et al.'s 2010 NRHP Evaluation Report for the Miller Street Landfill (45KI760),
- Pacific Geoarchaeological Services' 2010 Final Geomorphic Investigations at Foster Island Technical Memorandum, and
- Goodman et al.'s 2008 Foster Island Ground Penetrating Radar Survey.

Throughout the report should be consistent in identifying consultant firms (e.g., p. 4-7, where ICF is identified as conducting background research, but WSDOT, rather than BOAS, is identified as identifying areas of archaeological probability) and individual employees (e.g., p. 6-106, where individual ICF employees are named, but employees involved in other investigations are not identified).

Several paragraphs in Chapter 5 need more references for the information presented in them (e.g., 5-7, 5-15, 5-17).

Lake Washington Boulevard (LWB)
While a tree-planted central median is certainly a common feature of many boulevards and several Olmsted Brothers-designed boulevards in Seattle, it seems unlikely that it was a design feature of Lake Washington Boulevard east of Montlake Boulevard (see 1936 aerials on KC Imap at http://www.kingcounty.gov/operations/gis/Maps/iMAP.aspx)
Installation of a planted median here (7-42, 72 and elsewhere) most likely is inauthentic and detracts from historically accurate and appropriate design, no matter how aesthetically appealing it may be.

Emphasis on transportation, linearity and the horizontal alignment of boulevards (7-42, 43, 70, 72, 73 and elsewhere) as the sole element of their integrity is misleading and erroneous – vertical alignment, plantings and views are not discussed. The Olmsteds' intention and comprehensive design approach for boulevards was to produce aesthetic and recreational experiences rather than just transportation from entry to exit.

While traffic volumes on LWB moving north through the Arboretum are expected to decline due to removal of the Thompson Expressway ramps (7-78, 79), there is no discussion of left-turning off-ramp traffic moving south from 24th Ave. through the Arboretum. The off-ramp traffic heading south is most likely to cause adverse effects to the Boulevard and Arboretum – and should be discussed, along with potential measures to manage it if it causes adverse effects.

Montlake Boulevard
Removal of "all or part of" the Montlake Boulevard Median between East Hamlin and SR520 (7-73 and elsewhere) should be decided in favor of retaining sufficient median area to allow tree planting, since the historic and aesthetic character of the southern approach to Montlake Bridge is dependent on the median. Why not commit to this now and reduce the impacts of proposed construction?

Washington Park Arboretum
See comments on LWB traffic management.
The report refers to the "revised historic boundaries of the Washington Park Arboretum" (p. 76-80). Who revised the boundaries, and when? Does this refer to the preceding discussion of decisions (by WSDOT?) to change the boundaries of the contributing elements of the NRHP property? If so, the revisions are not to the historic boundaries at all. These are two very different things.

Montlake Historic District
Lid plantings will require removal of several mature "specimen trees" (7-75) - why can't some be saved for replanting and others replaced with the same species as part of the landscape design for the lid?

Montlake Cut
While the primary impetus for creation of the Cut was marine transportation, it has also served recreational purposes and had walkways, viewpoints and perhaps decorative landscaping along its banks and slopes for much or all of its existence. These historic landscape elements are entirely ignored in the discussion (p.7-40, 41). Construction of a second bridge will alter the experience of land-based recreational users of the Cut.

Montlake Portage Area
Exhibit 4-3 (p. 4-8) references BOAS' various reports for the conclusion that the Montlake Portage area likely does not retain significant historic properties because of modern ground disturbance. This is not true – neither of BOAS' reports makes that conclusion (see Blukis Onat et al. 2005:94-95; 2007a:iii, 23-25, 33, 48). Given that the statement in Exhibit 4-3 is incorrect, will WSDOT need to revise its consideration of cultural resources in the area?

Miller Street Landfill and Vicinity
The brief discussion of reports of bottle dumps within the boundaries of 45KI760 seems incomplete (p. 3-4). The statement "it [is] unlikely that these bottle dumps were associated with the Miller Street Landfill if the bottles recovered pre-dated 1910" is unclear. Are the ages of the bottles known? If the bottles post-date 1910, then it is likely that they were associated with the Miller Street Landfill. And if they do pre-date 1910, then although they may not be associated with the formal, official landfill they certainly are evidence of an earlier use of that location for garbage disposal, one that may relate to the City's selection of that location for the formal landfill.

The statement that "no historical or precontact…cultural resources were encountered [in the Seattle Study area]" (p. 6-2) is incorrect. Isn't the Miller Street Landfill an historical cultural resource?

King County HPP's comments on the Miller Street Landfill evaluation report should be included in Attachment 2, Agency Consultations.

Foster Island
The report states that "Further ethnographic study was completed in 2009" (p. 4-7).. Where is the study? Shouldn't that be included in the Attachments?

The report references a work plan for archaeological investigations on Foster Island that was reviewed by the tribes and DAHP (p. 6-2). Shouldn't that be included in the Attachments?

The discussion of stratigraphy in the second paragraph of p. 6-27 is confusing. Does the depth of the glacial deposits refer to the depth of the top of those deposits or of the top and bottom?

Mention is made of "archaeological deposits". I thought there were no archaeological deposits on Foster Island. Why the distinction between glacial clay and till? The last part of the paragraph seems to treat them differently.

Clarifications Needed

Why are usual and accustomed fishing areas for only the Muckleshoot Tribe (and not other Tribes) mentioned (p. 1-3)?

In the paragraph portage area, mention is made of a "Duwamish village…located east of the mouth of the creek" (p. 3-6). Does this refer to the village east of the mouth of Arboretum Creek, which is not on the portage?

No vertical dimension is specified in the general discussion and definition of "the" APE (p. 4-1 to 4-4). Since the vertical extent of a project is crucial for assessing potential archaeological impacts, this is a critical omission that should be corrected.

Bryn Mawr is incorrectly identified as the ancestral village of John Cheshiahud (p. 5-17).

Discussion of effects on 2904 and 2908 Montlake Boulevard should clarify that these properties are eligible only as contributing properties, not individually (p. 7-47, 48).

Is the Arboretum (designed in 1936) associated with the A-Y-P Exposition (open in 1909), or is association with Lake Washington Boulevard and Washington Park (built in the early 1900s) meant here (p. 7-49)?

There is only one owner of property in the Arboretum, so reference to approval of noise walls by "adjacent property owners" seems unnecessary (p. 7-79).

If you wish to discuss any comments in more detail, please contact us directly by telephone or electronic mail. Charlie Sundberg can be reached at 206.296.8673 or charlie.sundberg@kingcounty.gov; Philippe LeTourneau can be reached at 206.296.5217 or philippe.letourneau@kingcounty.gov.

Sincerely,

Charlie Sundberg, Preservation Planner

Philippe LeTourneau, Preservation Archaeologist

Appendix C

Forms for Previously Identified Properties

National Register of Historic Places Inventory Nomination Form: Denny-Fuhrman School

25N 4E 20

Form 10-300
(Rev. 6-72)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES INVENTORY – NOMINATION FORM

(Type all entries - complete applicable sections)

STATE:	Washington
COUNTY:	King KI 162
FOR NPS USE ONLY	
ENTRY DATE	

1. NAME

COMMON: Seward School lunchroom and gymnasium

AND/OR HISTORIC: Denny-Fuhrman School

2. LOCATION

STREET AND NUMBER: Seward School, north side E. Louisa, between Franklin E. and Boylston E.

CITY OR TOWN: Seattle 98102

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: #1 - Honorable Joel Pritchard

STATE: Washington — CODE: 53

COUNTY: King — CODE: 033

3. CLASSIFICATION

CATEGORY (Check One)	OWNERSHIP		STATUS	ACCESSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC
☐ District ☒ Building ☐ Site ☐ Structure ☐ Object	☒ Public ☐ Private ☐ Both	Public Acquisition: ☐ In Process ☐ Being Considered	☒ Occupied ☐ Unoccupied ☐ Preservation work in progress	Yes: ☐ Restricted ☒ Unrestricted ☐ No

PRESENT USE (Check One or More as Appropriate)

☐ Agricultural	☐ Government	☐ Park	☐ Transportation	☐ Comments
☐ Commercial	☐ Industrial	☐ Private Residence	☒ Other (Specify)	
☒ Educational	☐ Military	☐ Religious	school sports	
☐ Entertainment	☐ Museum	☐ Scientific		

4. OWNER OF PROPERTY

OWNER'S NAME: Seattle Public Schools

STREET AND NUMBER: Seattle Public Schools, 815 - Fourth North

CITY OR TOWN: Seattle 98109

STATE: Washington — CODE: 53

5. LOCATION OF LEGAL DESCRIPTION

COURTHOUSE, REGISTRY OF DEEDS, ETC: King County Auditor's Office

STREET AND NUMBER: King County Courthouse

CITY OR TOWN: Seattle 98104

STATE: Washington — CODE: 53

6. REPRESENTATION IN EXISTING SURVEYS

TITLE OF SURVEY: None

DATE OF SURVEY: ☐ Federal ☐ State ☐ County ☐ Local

DEPOSITORY FOR SURVEY RECORDS:

STREET AND NUMBER:

CITY OR TOWN:

STATE: — CODE:

FOR NPS USE ONLY: STATE: Washington; COUNTY: King; ENTRY NUMBER; DATE

SEE INSTRUCTIONS

7. DESCRIPTION

CONDITION	(Check One)					
	☒ Excellent	☐ Good	☐ Fair	☐ Deteriorated	☐ Ruins	☐ Unexposed
	(Check One)			(Check One)		
	☐ Altered	☒ Unaltered		☒ Moved	☐ Original Site	

DESCRIBE THE PRESENT AND ORIGINAL (If known) PHYSICAL APPEARANCE

The Denny-Fuhrman School building, now the Seward School lunchroom and gymnasium, was originally built facing east generally in the center of the block on the side facing Boylston Avenue. In 1917 it was moved to its present site on the side street of the school block. The building is 60' x 80', one story, with entrances north and south, windows east and west expressing the former classrooms. The exterior is mainly 1' x 6' lap siding, with simple trim of 1' x 4' and 1' x 6' with cornices over the doors. Windows are very large and double hung. Doors are double and lead to small porches which have great arched openings in the side of the building, 20' wide and 14' high. The roof is made of three separate hipped roofs and a flat area: hipped roofs over gym and lunchroom and north side, flat over the center and south but sloping slightly for drainage. The roof is composition shingle.

The exterior of the building appears as it was originally built. As was true in the original location, one entrance is gained by a flight of stairs. Originally there were toilets and lavatories in the basement but after relocation, the building was placed on brick piers with no basement. The interior has seen changes in the divisions between classrooms, but one can discern the major divisions in the half of the building used for the lunchroom, even to the cloakroom area out in the central hall.

The structure is in good repair, some original woodwork remaining on the interior, and was painted within the last five years on the exterior. Windows on the east face have wire to protect them from the balls of the playground outside. Windows on the west have wire on the inside for protection from activities in the gym.

The building has a comfortable square look, with 3' wide eaves and arched porches lending a sense of shelter. The generous hall, up to 20' wide where there are no closets, high ceilings, tall doors, and windows almost filling the two sides, give the small structure a pleasant open feeling from within. A hint of original stove heating is found in evidence of four chimneys, with two still protruding through the roof.

SEE INSTRUCTIONS

Form 10-300a
(July 1969)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
INVENTORY - NOMINATION FORM

(Continuation Sheet)

STATE	
Washington	
COUNTY	
King	
FOR NPS USE ONLY	
ENTRY NUMBER	DATE

(Number all entries)

#8 - Significance
Seward School lunchroom and gymnasium

The building well represents a link with the past history of Seattle Public Schools, as well as architecturally exemplifying American Primitive construction and design.

8. SIGNIFICANCE

PERIOD *(Check One or More as Appropriate)*

- [ ] Pre-Columbian
- [ ] 15th Century
- [ ] 16th Century
- [ ] 17th Century
- [ ] 18th Century
- [x] 19th Century
- [x] 20th Century

SPECIFIC DATE(S) *(If Applicable and Known)* 1893 to date

AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE *(Check One or More as Appropriate)*

- Aboriginal
  - [ ] Prehistoric
  - [ ] Historic
- [ ] Agriculture
- [x] Architecture
- [ ] Art
- [ ] Commerce
- [ ] Communications
- [ ] Conservation
- [x] Education
- [ ] Engineering
- [ ] Industry
- [ ] Invention
- [ ] Landscape Architecture
- [ ] Literature
- [ ] Military
- [ ] Music
- [ ] Political
- [ ] Religion/Philosophy
- [ ] Science
- [ ] Sculpture
- [ ] Social/Humanitarian
- [ ] Theater
- [ ] Transportation
- [ ] Urban Planning
- [ ] Other *(Specify)*

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Denny-Fuhrman School building is the oldest frame school building in a generally unaltered state in the city of Seattle. It is also the only remaining example of a "one-room schoolhouse".

The Denny-Fuhrman School building, now the Seward School lunchroom and gymnasium, was built in 1893 on land said to cost $8,730. Although it has been moved on the school grounds, it appears as originally built: a one-story frame structure. Originally it was only partially divided inside, with all eight grades in one room. But by 1897 enrollment had risen to 70 and three classrooms were established.

The Denny-Fuhrman Addition to the City of Seattle was in 1893, far from the center of town. Descriptions of the area by early students noted that the school was in a setting of thick forest, with pastures to the South. Only footpaths lead to the lakes, to the east and west: Portage Bay and Lake Union. Streets running north and south, to the main town of Seattle, were only "cowpaths". The easiest means of transportation was by boat to the south end of Lake Union, and thence by street to the main part of town.

However, with the building of Broadway High School in 1902, more population moved east and north of the center of town. This increased the population of the North Broadway district, and by 1904 the enrollment of Denny-Fuhrman was 206. Overcrowding brought pressure on the school board to build an addition to the school, and in 1905 a new frame structure was constructed to the west of the little building. These two frame buildings were then renamed Seward School for Sec. of State William Henry Seward.

By 1917 overcrowding again forced building of an addition. This was a brick structure placed on the site of the original building, with the latter moved around to the sourth side of the school grounds. The original frame building continues to be used in that location for lunchroom and gymnasium.

The Seward lunchroom is probably the best known of the three structures comprising Seward School since it is the site of most of the school social and educational gatherings and is also the location of community group meetings after school hours. It remains significant and contributory to the community and educational development of that area of the city, as well as reminiscent of the more intimate and humble days of public education.

SEE INSTRUCTIONS

9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Ross, Mary (Mrs. Edward A., Jr.). Personal interview, 1973. Residence: 2808 Broadway East, Seattle.

Seattle Public Schools, Histories of the Seattle Public Schools. Seattle: Seattle Public Schools' Administrative and Service Center, 1951 and 1961 editions.

Seward School, Seattle. Typewritten notes kept at school office.

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE COORDINATES DEFINING A RECTANGLE LOCATING THE PROPERTY						OR	LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE COORDINATES DEFINING THE CENTER POINT OF A PROPERTY OF LESS THAN TEN ACRES					
CORNER	LATITUDE			LONGITUDE			LATITUDE			LONGITUDE		
	Degrees	Minutes	Seconds	Degrees	Minutes	Seconds	Degrees	Minutes	Seconds	Degrees	Minutes	Seconds
NW	°	'	"	°	'	"	°	'	"	°	'	"
NE	°	'	"	°	'	"	N47	38	36	W122	19	13
SE	°	'	"	°	'	"						
SW	°	'	"	°	'	"						

APPROXIMATE ACREAGE OF NOMINATED PROPERTY: less than one

LIST ALL STATES AND COUNTIES FOR PROPERTIES OVERLAPPING STATE OR COUNTY BOUNDARIES

STATE:	CODE	COUNTY	CODE
STATE:	CODE	COUNTY:	CODE
STATE:	CODE	COUNTY:	CODE
STATE:	CODE	COUNTY:	CODE

11. FORM PREPARED BY

NAME AND TITLE:
Margaret A. Corley, King County Liaison

ORGANIZATION: Seattle Historical Society

DATE: October, 1973

STREET AND NUMBER:
2161 East Hamlin Street

CITY OR TOWN: Seattle

STATE: Washington

CODE: 53

12. STATE LIAISON OFFICER CERTIFICATION

As the designated State Liaison Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665), I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the National Park Service. The recommended level of significance of this nomination is:

National ☐ State ☐ Local ☐

Name: Charles H. Odegaard

Title: Director - Washington State Parks and Recreation Comm.

Date

NATIONAL REGISTER VERIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is included in the National Register.

Director, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation

Date

ATTEST:

Keeper of The National Register

Date

SEE INSTRUCTIONS

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1973—729-147/1442 3-1

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form: Seattle Apartment Buildings 1900-1957

(Rev. Aug. 2002) (Expires 1-31-2009)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Multiple Property Documentation Form

This form is used for documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (National Register Bulletin 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information. For additional space, use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer to complete all items.

X New Submission ____ Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Seattle Apartment Buildings, 1900 - 1957

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each.)

Purpose-built Apartment Buildings in Seattle, constructed between 1900 and 1957

C. Form Prepared by

name/title Mimi Sheridan AICP

street & number 3630 37th Avenue West telephone 206-270-8727

city or town Seattle state WA zip code 98199

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature and title of certifying official — Date 11·20·08

WASHINGTON STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
State or Federal Agency or Tribal government

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Signature of the Keeper — Date of Action

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Provide the following information on continuation sheets. Cite the letter and the title before each section of the narrative. Assign page numbers according to the instructions for continuation sheets *in How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (National Register Bulletin 16B). Fill in page numbers for each section in the space below.

	Pages Numbers
E. Statement of Historic Contexts (If more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.)	1
F. Associated Property Types (Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)	68
G. Geographical Data	87
H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods (Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)	87
I. Major Bibliographical References (List major written works and primary location of additional documentation: State Historic Preservation Office, other State agency, Federal agency, local government, university, or other, specifying repository.)	88
Appendix: Partial List of Apartments	

Primary Location of Additional Data:

X State Historic Preservation Office

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.). A federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 120 hours per response including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, 1849 C St., NW, Washington, DC 20240.

E. STATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXTS

INTRODUCTION

This context statement considers the development of multifamily housing in Seattle since 1900, the approximate time when apartment buildings as we define them today were first constructed in the city. The focus is on purpose-built apartment buildings and apartment hotels of more than four units. Other types of multifamily housing, including transient and workers' hotels, are discussed below in order to better understand the historical context, but are not included in this MPD. The ending date of 1957 was selected because a new zoning ordinance passed in that year significantly changed the form, size and location of subsequent apartment buildings.

The MPD and context statement are based on extensive review of the literature relating to the development of apartment buildings generally and in Seattle specifically. The other vital source was a field survey of approximately 400 apartment buildings and a more detailed inventory of 100 apartment buildings throughout the city. The survey identified four significant sub-types of Seattle apartment buildings:

- Low-Rise Apartment Block (less than 4 stories);
- Mid-Rise Apartment Block (5 to 8 stories);
- High-Rise Apartment Block (more than 8 stories); and,
- Courtyard/Townhouse Apartments.

Definitions of these sub-types are found in ***Section F: Associated Property Types.***

A partial list of apartment buildings that could be considered under this multiple property listing is attached as an Appendix. Mention of a specific apartment building does not necessarily mean that the building is significant enough to merit individual listing in the National Register of Historic Places, or that it meets local criteria for landmark designation. Also, omission of a specific building does not indicate that it does not merit listing or designation. Note that buildings are referred to as "apartment buildings" even if they are now in condominium or cooperative ownership. These reflect the legal circumstances of ownership, not the building form. Many older apartment buildings that were rentals for decades are now condominiums, without any significant physical alteration.

The MPD begins with consideration of the historic contexts of Seattle apartment development, reviewing influences from Europe, the eastern United States, and California. It then discusses three sub-themes of apartment development that were seen in the city in the 1900-1957 study period:

- Early Purpose-Built Apartments
- Apartments as Middle-Class Housing
- Apartments as Home

HISTORIC CONTEXTS

Throughout Seattle's history, multifamily housing has been perhaps the city's most diverse building type, ranging from modest duplexes to concrete high-rises. They have provided housing for people in a wide range of age groups, economic levels and family circumstances. As the city grew, the building type matured to meet these varying needs with specific building characteristics, features and amenities. Apartment buildings provide opportunities for lower cost living quarters, low maintenance, proximity to work and shopping and other amenities that may be unaffordable in a single-family home. They have traditionally been considered temporary housing while in college or while saving to purchase a house, but are increasingly becoming permanent accommodations for people who prefer the simpler lifestyle or more central locations, or who cannot afford to buy a home.

At the turn of the 20th century the middle class in the United States firmly held the belief that the single-family home was the most desirable and appropriate living arrangement, and an important goal to strive toward. *Architectural Record* called apartment houses "a dangerous enemy of American domesticity....done out of necessity rather than by choice.[1] The middle class associated apartment living with the city tenements where working people lived. This was true despite the fact that in 1900 more than three-quarters of urban Americans lived in rented apartments. Apartments were considered acceptable for those without children, but families sought outdoor space for children to

[1] Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America,* (Cambridge: the MIT Press, 1981), p. 150.

play.[2] However, by the early twentieth century the rising cost of land made ownership of single-family homes difficult for much of the population. Strong housing demand led to intensive apartment development in cities throughout the country, especially during the prosperous 1920s. Unmarried and widowed people without families found apartments particularly suitable for their needs. The larger buildings also provided amenities such as refrigeration, radios, elegant surroundings and convenient locations that would be more expensive in single-family residences.

European Influences

Consideration of influences from Europe and other U. S. cities provides insight into the development and forms of apartment buildings in Seattle. The population density in European cities meant that apartment living was common at least as early as first-century Rome. Most continental cities were originally constrained by expanding rings of defensive walls, resulting in high population densities in the city centers. Paris developed in this manner, with the vast majority of the population living in multifamily quarters. Late nineteenth century improvements swept away older buildings, replacing them with landscaped parks and broad tree-lined boulevards. The boulevards were soon lined with fashionable apartment houses for upper and middle-class families eager to enjoy the improved quality of life the city afforded. The invention of the elevator allowed people to occupy the upper floors and enjoy views and light without the inconvenience of stairs. Accordingly, architecture and ornament became more elaborate

[2] Clifford E. Clark, Jr., *The American Family Home, 1800-1960*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986, p. 182-183.

to attract fashionable tenants, and apartment amenities and configurations developed to meet residents' needs. "Flats," containing several reception rooms on one floor, were particularly popular because of their suitability for entertaining. The elegance of these buildings profoundly influenced the development of New York City through the 1920s.[3] The popularity of these apartments with the upper- and middle classes spread to major U. S. cities, with the buildings taking on varying forms.

London developed differently than continental cities, and influenced North American housing and growth patterns more significantly. Although it was one of the world's most populous cities, it did not have the high densities seen on the continent. Numerous single-family homes, both row houses and freestanding, were built within a short distance of the city center. The English placed a high value on privacy, feeling that proper family life was possible only in a single-family home, not in a flat where one's private life could be exposed to others in stairs and hallways.

However, rising property values and increased urban density during the Industrial Revolution made townhouses unaffordable for many families. First-class apartment buildings or "mansion flats" began to appear in the 1850s, providing the amenities of a townhouse for those who could not afford one. Most apartments for the middle- and upper-classes emphasized privacy, eliminating open passages and stairways; they often had two stories to separate the bedrooms from the entertaining rooms. As in Paris,

---

[3] James M. Goode, *Best Addresses* (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1988), pp. 529-531.

residents learned that entertaining could be considerably easier in a spacious flat than in the traditional London townhouse with two rooms per floor. Flats also made it much easier to have such modern amenities as running water, gas lighting and central heating. However, the tradition of single-family housing and privacy remained strong, and the individual house or rowhouse is still the basic residential structure in much of London, just as the single-family home is in the United States.[4]

East Coast Influences

Despite strong initial resistance, upper- and middle-class apartment living became popular in New York City during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, directly reflecting European influences. Large multifamily dwellings were first built to house workers moving to cities to work in the factories of the Industrial Revolution. At that time, any "house or part of a house occupied or arranged to be occupied by three or more families living independently of each other and doing their own cooking on the premises" was defined as a tenement.[5] They were designed for worker housing and, accordingly, were shunned by the middle and upper classes.

Later in the century, two factors changed the situation: increases in central city land values as populations grew, and advances in technology. In the 1870s, New York developers responded to rising land prices by building "French flats," luxury apartments

---

[4] Goode, *Best Addresses*, p. 534-535.

[5] Thomas E. Norton and Jerry E. Patterson, *Living It Up: A Guide to the Named Apartment Houses of New York*, (New York: Athenaeum, 1984), p. 7.

based on the Parisian model. The Stuyvesant Apartments, designed in 1869 by the Paris-educated architect Richard Morris Hunt, is called the first U. S. "apartment building." It rented quickly to young couples, widows and "artistic people" (including influential writers).[6] Soon numerous apartment buildings appeared, boasting amenities such as luxurious lobbies, elevators, service staffs, central heating and gas lighting. Steel-frame construction, fire proofing and elevators allowed greater building heights, away from the noise and dirt of the street. In larger units, the areas for entertaining, sleeping and service were kept separate, just as in a single-family home. As in Paris, elegant architecture and decor, as well as convenience, were used to attract tenants.

By the 1880s New Yorkers saw the construction of numerous 10- to 12-story apartment buildings, especially around Central Park. Many housed middle-class families in four-to-five room units, as compared to the six-to-ten rooms of more upscale units. Developers also offered elegant "bachelor apartments" with two or three rooms but no kitchen; meals were eaten in a central dining room or in a restaurant.[7] A similar option was the apartment hotel, often with no private kitchens but with a restaurant on the first floor. These were considered ideal for newcomers getting established in the city and busy professionals or entertainers who did not have the time for a household or the need for a long lease.[8] However, high labor costs led to decreasing service and the lines

---

[6] Elizabeth Hawes, New York, New York: How the Apartment House Transformed the Life of the City (1869-1930), (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), p. 7.
[7] Goode, *Best Addresses* p. 538.
[8] Russell Lynes, *The Domesticated Americans*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 5

between the two types blurred; most buildings eventually added individual kitchens and the restaurants opened to public diners.

As land values rose during the postwar building boom of the 1920s, 77 percent of all residential construction in New York City was apartment houses. Despite this, apartment houses were viewed somewhat negatively. In 1929, R.W. Sexton said of apartment houses, hotels and apartment hotels that "...none of these buildings should be rightfully classed as a home....they all lack the very fundamentals on which the home is founded...the most important is perhaps privacy. Another is individuality."[9] He goes on to admit that multi-dwelling houses offer a new type of home, characterized chiefly by convenience. Regardless of these beliefs, people in many parts of the country were turning increasingly toward apartment living, usually either for economy or for convenience.

The driving forces behind the design of individual apartment buildings were the economic use of space and the provision of adequate light and air. This was not only due to regulations, but because apartments with light and airy interiors were easier to rent and attracted higher prices. Other important design considerations in quality apartments were fireproof construction, attractive lobbies (often quite small) and adequate exits. To increase privacy and the feeling of a private home, many of the best buildings avoided corridors, with individual entries leading to one to four units.

---

[9] R.W. Sexton, *American Apartment Houses, Hotels and Apartment Hotels of Today*, (New York: Architectural Book Publishing Co., Inc., 1929), p. 1.

Apartments with two-to-five rooms were most popular. In larger units, an effort was made to separate the kitchen and service areas from the living areas. Another major selling point for apartments was their provision of conveniences that were too costly for the average home at the time, such as telephones, refrigeration, built-in radios and even electric dumb waiters and pneumatic mail delivery.

In the 1920s apartment houses for the upper class had reached new heights of luxury, featuring servants' quarters, fireplaces, terraces and elaborate detailing.[10] Although apartments were still designed primarily for childless couples and single people, some buildings accommodated children with playrooms and outdoor play areas. At the same time, more units with two to four rooms were built for middle class and working people.[11] Much of the loss of space was made up in increasingly sumptuous appointments and conveniences. Efficient space use was stressed, leading to the foldaway bed and table. Smaller apartments also increased the developer's income, since they rented for higher rates per square foot; this, in turn, led to more apartment construction.

These trends directly influenced apartment development in Seattle, since much of the capital used to finance local construction came from Eastern sources. The city saw the development of both luxury buildings and efficiency units, and of apartment hotels that changed to regular apartments as labor costs increased. At least two early apartment

---

[10] Goode, *Best Addresses*, p. 538

[11] Steven Ruttenbaum, *Mansions in the Clouds* (New York: Balsam Press, 1986) p. 81

projects had direct New York connections. Developer John F. Douglas acquired New York financing for both the Manhattan Flats (1905), an early full-block complex, and the large Waldorf Hotel (1906).[12] The Rivoli (1909) was designed by Howells & Stokes, a New York firm with extensive apartment experience that had been hired to prepare a plan for the University of Washington's downtown property.

West Coast Influences

The building boom in San Francisco after the Great Fire of 1906 created a large market for the so-called efficiency apartment.[13] Instead of a separate bedroom, these units typically had a "dressing room," a space larger than a closet but smaller than a bedroom. San Francisco was particularly notable for the early use of the Murphy bed, which folded into the wall and allowed the main room to be used as a living room during the day. These efficiency units, often with Murphy beds, soon became a major feature of Seattle housing development as well.

The influence of Southern California is also clearly seen in Seattle apartment housing of the 1920s. The Los Angeles area quadrupled in population between 1910 and 1930, bringing an urgent need for new housing forms for long-term visitors, single people, childless couples and lower paid workers.[14] To meet this demand, architects and

---

[12] Neal Hines, *Denny's Knoll: A History of the Metropolitan Tract of the University of Washington*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1980), p. 72.
[13] Paul Groth, *Living Downtown: The History of Residential Hotels in the United States*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), p. 86.
[14] Wright, *Building the Dream*, p. 150.

developers designed the garden courtyard apartment—a unique form to accommodate increased density while providing privacy, light, air and a connection with the prized California landscape. Earlier examples, starting about 1916, were bungalow courts, groups of small inexpensive cottages arranged around defined spaces. In later examples, the cottages were merged into larger structures around courtyards. The courtyard apartment lent itself to both plain and elegant treatments, but in most cases each residence had its own entrance and direct access to a landscaped court, often filled with fountains and semitropical foliage. Because these buildings could be sited on the basic single-family parcel (50 by 150 feet) found throughout Los Angeles, they fit easily into neighborhoods and escaped much of the stigma attached to traditional apartment blocks.[15] The wealthy and well-known lived in the more elegant apartments, while less elaborate buildings met the needs of working men and women. A romanticized version of Spanish Colonial Revival was the most common style.

During the 1920s courtyard apartments became one of the most popular multifamily housing types in Seattle. Although some were in the Mediterranean Revival styles, most were in variations of Tudor or French Norman, considered by some architects to be more appropriate to our climate.

---

[15] Stefanos Polyzoides, Roger Sherwood, and James Tice, *Courtyard Housing in Los Angeles: A Typological Analysis,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), p. 14.

SUB-THEMES

Early Seattle Multifamily Accommodations: Frontier Seattle: 1852-1889

It is believed that apartment houses as they are defined today were first built in Seattle in approximately 1901. Prior to that time, Seattleites lived in a variety of living situations that are now rare due to both changing preferences and increased regulation. Seattle's early years, and the associated multifamily accommodations and building types, are discussed here as precursors to the apartment house that developed later.

Seattle was settled almost simultaneously by two disparate groups. In September 1852, the Collins and Maple families made their claims in the Duwamish Valley, south of Elliott Bay, and established farms in the fertile alluvial soil. Two months later, the Denny party landed at windswept Alki Point, at the west end of Elliott Bay. This group had grander ambitions and, after a few winter months, moved eastward to a more sheltered area with deeper water, the site that became the heart of downtown Seattle. There they established a port town that thrived on trade and the export of coal and the raw lumber that covered the hillsides. The first industry came in 1853, when Henry Yesler opened his sawmill. The all-purpose cookhouse next door had bunks upstairs,

serving as Seattle's first multifamily housing. Soon, the village was shipping lumber to the gold rush boomtowns of California.[16]

The new port grew slowly, with only 302 people in 1860. However, the city of Seattle was incorporated on December 2, 1869, and soon boasted of three newspapers, a bank, a public school and a Territorial University. Transportation remained a challenge, as it was not until 1875 that scheduled steamship service to San Francisco began. Early photos and maps show that most early Seattle families lived in simple wood frame houses. One of the largest 1850s buildings was Felker House, which accommodated visitors and families awaiting their own quarters.[17]

As with most frontier towns, much of the city's population was transient. In 1870 two-thirds of the population were males, many of whom lived part of the year in logging, mining or fishing camps elsewhere or arrived as seamen on ships that frequented the wharves. When logging or fishing was slack, men flocked to the city for supplies and entertainment. The permanent population generally lived north of Yesler's Wharf (Yesler Way), while "south of the pier stretched rooming houses, stores, ships, and saloons," all catering to these transients.[18] An 1878 birds'-eye view of the town shows a

---

[16] Mildred Tanner Andrews (ed.). *Pioneer Square: Seattle's Oldest Neighborhood*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005.
[17] Andrews, *Pioneer Square*, p. 16.
[18] Quintard Taylor , *The Forging of a Black Community: Seattle's Central District from 1870 through the Civil Rights Era*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994), p. 17.

waterfront filled with square-riggers and sternwheelers, and buildings stretching to Denny Hill on the north and ten blocks east to the forested hillsides.[19]

During the 1880s the frontier village became a thriving boomtown. The population increased more than tenfold from 3,533 people in 1880 to nearly 43,000 in 1890. Trade in lumber and coal flourished, with California, British Columbia and Alaska as major trading partners. Seattle had also become the center for Puget Sound trade, with ports connected by a fleet of sternwheelers. More substantial buildings like the Mansard-roofed Frye's Opera House, the Victorian Yesler-Leary Building and the brick Second Empire-style Occidental Hotel gave downtown an urban air. The wealthiest citizens built ornate Queen Anne-style mansions. There were two schools, one at 6th and Madison streets, and another well north of downtown at 6th and Wall streets.[20]

Land uses were mixed, with commercial buildings, hotels, duplexes and single-family homes located close to one another within a few blocks of the waterfront. Buildings often had storefronts on the first floor and a combination of offices and living quarters above, with uses changing as demand developed. Those without families often lived in boarding houses and residential hotels in the downtown area. Single-family homes began to spread out to First Hill and beyond, as cable cars began operation in 1887 and streetcars in 1889. This pattern changed suddenly on June 6, 1889, when the entire

---

[19] Andrews, *Pioneer Square*, p. 37.
[20] Jeffrey Karl Ochsner and Dennis Alan Andersen, *Distant Corner: Seattle Architects and the Legacy of H. H. Richardson*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003), pp. 57.

business district—more than thirty blocks of wooden buildings—went up in a conflagration. Although the residential areas were little damaged, many transient hotels in the commercial district were lost.[21]

During this early period, four types of multifamily accommodations developed: attached houses, rooming and boarding houses, workers' hotels and apartment or family hotels.

- **Attached Houses:** Seattle families who could not afford a single-family home could rent attached housing such as duplexes, triplexes or fourplexes, typically with an individual entrance for each unit or pair of units. Since they were mostly in denser areas that have been redeveloped, few of these survive today, although they are now a popular option for new construction. The rowhouse configuration, a common feature of denser East Coast cities, did not become very popular in Seattle, although records show that some examples were built in the pre-World War I period.[22] Another common configuration was the four-unit block, which often looked much like a large single-family home. The Classic Box house that became popular in the first decade of the century could be adapted to either a two- or four-unit configuration, and examples of these remain. With the popularity of Revival styles in the 1920s, four-unit blocks were also built in Colonial and Georgian styles.

[21] Ochsner and Andersen, *Distant Corner*, p. 57.
[22] Ochsner and Andersen, *Distant Corner*, pp. 242-243.

- **Rooming/Boarding Houses:** Two common residential options were often found within the single-family house form: rooming houses, where one rented a room and ate meals elsewhere; and boarding houses, where meals were served to residents. Little specific information is known about these facilities, but directory listings indicate that they were found in many of the city's denser neighborhoods, close to workplaces and transportation.

- **Workers' Hotels:** A step up from the rooming house was the workers' hotel, later known as the SRO or single room occupancy hotel. These catered largely to single men who rented by the week or month. These buildings were the most important source of housing for single working men in Seattle until World War II. The main characteristic that differentiated these buildings from apartments is that the individual rooms did not include a kitchen or a bathroom (although rooms often had a washbasin). Residents shared a toilet room and bathtub on each floor, and ate in nearby restaurants. Accordingly, these hotels were located primarily downtown or in other areas close to streetcar lines, restaurants, taverns, services and entertainment, with convenient access to the waterfront or industrial areas where the men worked.

These hotels were typically small brick-clad wood-frame or masonry buildings of two-to-four stories, with commercial uses on the ground floor. Many of them remain today as major elements of the urban fabric of Belltown and the Pioneer

Square and Chinatown-International District historic districts. Many of these facilities were closed in the 1970s because owners did not want to upgrade them to conform to stricter building fire codes passed after the fatal Ozark Hotel fire.[23] After sitting vacant for many years, most that survive have been converted to studio apartments for low-income residents, with individual bathing and cooking facilities.

- **Apartment/Family Hotels:** Another sub-type was the apartment hotel or family hotel. Those that remain extant evolved long ago into either apartments or hotels, and they have a similar building form to that of the apartment block, described below. Most of their distinctive features, such as formal dining rooms, ballrooms and other public spaces, have been lost, replaced by living units or, in some cases, public restaurants.

  Apartment hotels and family hotels catered to middle- and upper-class people who were in transition or did not want more permanent housing. Most hotels accepted weekly and monthly residents as well as more transient travelers, providing the easiest way for a person to get acceptable and convenient living accommodations without renting a house. Some people, especially bachelors, lived in such quarters for months or years.[24] Travelers also needed long-term accommodations, as people who came a long distance would often stay a

[23] Andrews, p. 138.

[24] Private clubs, including the Rainier Club, the Washington Athletic Club and the Women's University Club also provided transitional and permanent rooms and dining rooms. The YMCA, YWCA and similar organizations offered less expensive living quarters.

considerable length of time, bringing their families with them. Hotels catering to this need provided a wider range of amenities than the simpler hotels. The best documented example of this building type is the Chelsea Hotel, which opened in 1907 in time to accommodate visitors to the 1909 Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition. It was located in a quiet neighborhood with easy streetcar access to downtown, and offered maid service, a dining room, a rooftop garden for relaxation, and rooms for private entertaining. Both short- and long-term guests were welcomed, and some of the city's most prominent families lived there for a time. The advent of the automobile reduced the need for such accommodations and, by 1917 the Chelsea had been converted to apartments.[25] Most remaining examples, like the Chelsea, have had kitchens added and are now rented as apartments. Two buildings, the New Washington (now the Josephinum) and the Exeter are now senior housing, with central dining rooms. The Sorrento Hotel remains a hotel today.

Apartments as Middle-Class Housing: Booming Seattle: 1889-1923

It is not surprising that the development of denser housing options began during the period of intensive growth following the fire. Rebuilding began immediately after the fire. Building codes were quickly revised and within a month 88 fire-resistant brick buildings were under construction. The newer structures were on a larger scale and their red brick Romanesque facades gave the city a modern appearance. The city

[25] Miriam Sutermeister, Chelsea Family Hotel National Register Nomination Form, May 14, 1978.

undertook significant infrastructure improvements to prepare for further growth, including new streets and wharves and a new water supply to protect from future fires.

The major event of the post-fire era was undoubtedly the arrival in January 1893 of the Great Northern Railway, giving Seattle its first direct connection with the rest of the United States. The post-fire boom halted, however, with the Panic of 1893, which began with the stock market collapse of May 1893. Within a year, the local economy declined, with eleven banks out of business. The East Coast capital fueling Seattle's development was withdrawn, leading to a four-year recession.

In Seattle, however, the recession ended abruptly following the June 17, 1897 arrival of the steamship *Portland* with "a ton of gold" from the Klondike. The regional economy "was revitalized seemingly overnight as it house, outfitted, entertained and transported thousands of fortune seekers....at once the last frontier fantasy of the 19th century and the birth of modern Seattle."[26] The prolonged period of growth and construction lasted (with a brief slowdown due to World War I) until the Great Depression began.

By 1900 Seattle's population had exceeded 80,000, with 25,000 arriving in the previous three years alone.[27] It tripled to 237,000 by 1910 and to 315,312 in 1920. With the gold rush boom, the business district moved northward rapidly. Several skyscrapers, and a

---

[26] Lisa Mighetto and Marcia Montgomery, *Hard Drive to the Klondike*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002), p. vii.
[27] Walt Crowley and The HistoryLink Staff, *Seattle & King County Timeline* (Seattle: History Ink and University of Washington Press, 2001), p. 36.

new post office and library were built well to the north in the first decade of the new century. In 1907 the University of Washington began development of its downtown property on Fourth Avenue, and, in 1918, a major department store, Frederick & Nelson, opened at Sixth and Pine streets. City Engineer R. H. Thomson wanted to encourage further development to the north and by 1911 the western portion of Denny Hill had been sluiced into Elliott Bay. Much of the ensuing growth in Belltown and lower Queen Anne took the form of apartment buildings.

In 1891 the city doubled in area with the annexation of the Wallingford, Magnolia Green Lake and University neighborhoods. It doubled again in 1907, when Seattle annexed the adjoining towns of West Seattle, Ballard, Southeast Seattle, Columbia, Ravenna and South Park. Georgetown and Laurelhurst followed in 1910. Each one had its own business district, industry and residential neighborhoods. The city's first high school, Broadway High School, opened on Capitol Hill in 1902 and by 1923 six more high schools and dozens of elementary schools had been added.

By 1902 a dozen or so streetcar lines served the city. In that year they were consolidated into a single monopoly controlled by the Seattle Electric Company.[28] As competition from automobiles began, service became erratic and, in April 1918, the city acquired the entire system. Between 1900 and 1910, land uses became more separated, with people of all income levels moving out of downtown to developing close in neighborhoods such

[28] Leslie Blanchard, *The Street Railway Era in Seattle* (Forty Fort, PA: Harold E. Cox, 1968), endpaper.

as Queen Anne and Wallingford.[29] Apartment houses typically appeared near neighborhood commercial areas and street car lines, with the greatest number in Queen Anne, Wallingford, First Hill, Capitol Hill and the University District. Many of these apartment houses and nearby commercial areas remain today, forming the core of these neighborhoods.

The major event of the first decade of the century was the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, held on the University of Washington campus in 1909. The city invited the world to commemorate the 1897 gold rush and see its accomplishments—more than 3 million visitors attended. The exposition grounds were designed by the Olmsted Brothers, landscape architects, who also planned the city's parks and boulevards. The park and boulevard plan, first completed in 1903 and expanded in 1909, was substantially (although not entirely) implemented by the end of the 1920s.

Industrial and waterfront activity continued to grow, as the city's role as an international and regional trade center flourished. The Port of Seattle was formed in 1911, bringing public ownership to much of the central waterfront. In 1916 completion of the Hiram Chittenden Locks connected industrial areas of Lake Union and Salmon Bay with Puget Sound. World War I brought large shipbuilding contracts. Nearly 40,000 workers were employed at local shipyards, many crowding into downtown

[29] Roger Sale, *Seattle Past to Present (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1976), p. 80.*

workers' hotels and lodging houses.[30] Economic recovery after the war was slow, and it was not until the mid-1920s that construction resumed.

The extremely rapid growth of the first quarter of the century brought an acute need for housing of all types—for travelers, short-term residents, permanent residents and families. The city's builders and developers responded with a variety of housing types. Many commercial buildings had lodging rooms on upper floors, or even included hotels within their office buildings. Hotels and office buildings had similar room arrangements, with a wash basin in each room and toilet facilities at the end of the hall. The Terry-Denny Building on First Avenue South contained the Northern Hotel, and the nearby Holyoke Building had furnished rooms on the upper floors. The Butler Block, originally an office building, was converted to the more profitable hotel use in 1894, only a few years after its construction. The Austin A. Bell Building was initially described as having 65 apartments, even though its directory listing (1900) was under "Furnished Rooms" and its plan was much the same as that of the Pioneer Building, an office block.[31]

Family or apartment hotels then served much the same role as apartments did in later years by providing either short-term or permanent accommodations for middle- and upper-class people. The terms hotel, rooming house, and lodging house were ambiguous. The difference between a residential hotel or rooming house and an

---

[30] Andrews, *Pioneer Square*, p. 113.
[31] Ochsner and Andersen, *Distant Corner*, pp. 242-243.

apartment house was primarily a matter of name, rather than of design. Many residential buildings were typically identified as hotels, even if they primarily served permanent residents.[32] Terminology was so fluid that the same building could be listed in the city directory as a hotel one year and a boarding house the next. The term "apartment house" was little used, possibly because of the association with the workers' tenements of the East Coast. City directories had "apartment" listings, but these buildings appear to have been boarding houses, townhouses or apartment hotels rather than self-contained units with kitchens and baths.

Permanent hotel living was common in cities, and was highly stratified economically.[33] By the early 20th century Seattle had hotels designed and located specifically to serve the wealthy, the middle class and workers and transient laborers. The latter were by far the most common, occupying dozens of small two- four-story buildings in the downtown area. Those for the wealthy and upper middle class were fewer in number, but larger and much better appointed. The best-known accommodations, the large hotels, were rebuilt immediately after the 1889 fire, in larger and more opulent fashion. The Occidental Hotel, one of the best, replaced its 3-story structure with five stories and 150 rooms. The new Butler Hotel boasted of a 12,000 square foot dining room with separate sections for men and women and an orchestra for evening entertainment.[34]

---

[32] Ochsner and Andersen, *Distant Corner*, pp. 73-75.
[33] Groth, *Living Downtown*, p. 188.
[34] Henry Broderick, *"The 'HB' Story: Henry Broderick Relates Seattle's Yesterdays*. Seattle: Frank McCaffrey Publishers, 1969, pp. 120-124.

Although they were used by travelers visiting for a few days, the major clientele of the family hotels was people renting by the week or month. Two of the best family hotels were in the elegant residential neighborhood of First Hill: the Perry (1906-07) and the Sorrento (1907-08). The Perry, built by a New York company, was apart from downtown bustle but close to First Hill mansions. Seattleites and their visitors evidently considered it too pretentious, and it was converted to apartments and later to a hospital (later demolished).[35] The nearby Sorrento Hotel was not successful at first, but today is one of the few turn-of-the century hotels that survive as a hotel. The famed Washington Hotel (1903) was razed in the regrading of Denny Hill, and was replaced by the New Washington Hotel, which still exists as the Josephinum, a low-income residence.

Seattle developed as a streetcar city, rather than a walking city, which encouraged developers to promote single-family residences, with small lots to make them more affordable. The 1890s saw limited development of rowhouses similar to those seen in Eastern cities. One of the most elegant was Scurry Terrace, a series of four three-story Victorian terrace houses, built in 1889 by architect Elmer Fisher at Third and James streets. Architects Towle and Wilcox built two groups of five Queen Anne-style wood townhouses on Sixth Street and on Yesler Avenue, and J. A. DeProsse designed another group at Eighth Avenue and Columbia Street.[36] A similar design was the building now known as the Victorian Row Apartments, built in 1891. Although it had the general appearance of a townhouse, its three entries accessed twelve apartments, each with two

[35] Broderick, *The HB Story*, pp. 125.
[36] Ochsner and Andersen, *Distant Corner*, pp. 47, 242-243.

or three bedrooms.[37] Its typical Queen Anne townhouse features include two-story rectangular bays, scalloped skirting and gabled entrance porches with spindle work and turned posts.[38]

In 1892 noted architect John Parkinson designed and developed a row of stone townhouses at Marion Street and Twelfth Avenue (now Minor) on First Hill. This project had seven townhouses, each measuring 20 by 70 feet and having twelve rooms. It was envisioned that First Hill could develop as a dense area of townhouses, but the panic of 1893 ended such expensive development and this was the city's only known example of masonry townhouses until its demolition in the 1970s.[39]

The apartment block as it is known today, with a single primary entrance and individual living quarters with kitchens and bathrooms, appears to have first been constructed in Seattle around the turn of the century. The first such building may have been the St. Paul Flats, constructed in 1901 at Seneca Street and Summit Avenue by Edwin C. Burke, a wealthy real estate entrepreneur who had recently moved to Seattle from St. Paul, Minnesota.[40] In 1909 he formed a partnership with developer Bert Farrar, who had built

[37] The building has been restored and is now configured with 14 units of varying sizes.
[38] Shirley Courtois, "Victorian Row Apartments National Register Landmark Nomination Form," August 1990.
[39] Ochsner and Andersen, *Distant Corner*, pp. 242-243.
[40] *Seattle Times*, April 24, 1938.

the San Marco Apartments nearby at Minor Avenue and Spring Street in 1904.[41] The St. Paul, designed by Spalding and Russell of Tacoma, is a three-story block building, with a center entrance flanked by three-sided two-story bays. It was originally an elite building, with eighteen apartments of six to eight rooms each. It has been altered with new cladding and windows. The San Marco, generally similar in design and size, remains much as it was originally.[42]

A particularly well documented example of early and unique apartment development was the Manhattan Flats project, designed in 1905 by architect William P. White. The four buildings, bordering Boren, Minor and Howell avenues north of downtown, enclosed a grassy inner courtyard suitable for children's play. Suites were from two to five rooms, and children were allowed, with strict rules of conduct. Convenience and amenities were the marketing features, with stores on the first floor, phone service and an in-house kindergarten.[43] The project's name and the developer—the Manhattan Company—reflected its financing and influences, as it was based on New York models. It was called "the best and most complete flat plant on the Pacific Coast." Its three-story buildings and large courtyard had ample light and fresh air, contrasting with:

> "...an ordinary flat building with its cold exterior with unkempt yards and a general air of shiftlessness....perhaps the greatest eyesore in the universe. Until

---

[41] Burke and Farrar are best known as the primary developers of Kirkland, WA. Burke died in 1915, at the age of 47, from injuries received in an auto accident (*Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, 5/9/1915).

[42] *Seattle Times* (Conover, 12/13/47).

[43] "The Manhattan Flats," *Seattle Mail & Herald*, 12/30/1905.

> recently a great majority of our people lived in their own homes. Since 1901, however, there has been a very marked increase in the number of renters....The Eastern cheap tenement house with its attendant evils has found not root here....The men who designed and built our first apartment buildings are entitled to considerable credit because of the first-class structures they then erected. These now set the pace and hereafter only good flat buildings will be built, for no other could find tenants....The man of moderate income need no longer go without the conveniences that formerly were only within the reach of wealth, for a flat home with all conveniences is within the reach of any man."[44]

Apartment development during the first decade of the century concentrated primarily in the downtown area and the nearby neighborhoods of First Hill and Capitol Hill. Apartment buildings were heavily promoted as investments. One architect's catalog featured several sample plans, both elaborate ones and a simple four-square plan, which could be altered to suit various sites and pocketbooks. No regulations controlled the location of apartment buildings, but economics dictated that they were typically built on higher-value land close to downtown and near streetcar lines. As the catalog noted "Any fairly close-in lot in a good location, with good car service, is suitable, and the building, when completed and rented, will prove a source of satisfactory and permanent income."[45] Some apartments, however, were built in other neighborhoods, primarily

---

[44] "Western Flat Dwellers," *Seattle Mail & Herald*, 9/30/1905.

[45] Dose, West & Reinoehl, *Architecture of Dose, West & Reinoehl*, Seattle: 1908. p. 4.

near the commercial districts along streetcar lines. Some smaller buildings were also built in single-family areas.

Social conditions as well as economics and growth encouraged apartment development during the early 20th century. The increasing role of women in Seattle life and in the work force was a potent factor. Single women working in shops, offices and factories needed respectable and affordable housing, something that could not be obtained at the workers' hotels downtown.

The Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, held in 1909, influenced housing in two ways. One was that developers were eager to profit by accommodating visitors. The larger impact, however, was that this event was seen as a sign of the region's long-term growth potential, a place that was worthwhile investing in. Two of the best-known buildings of this period, both listed in the National Register, appear to have been directly connected with the exposition. The De la Mar apartment building was constructed by developer George Kinnear to house his friends who were visiting the fair. The Chelsea Apartments nearby were built to accommodate families visiting the fair.

World War I and a subsequent recession slowed new development, despite a critical need for housing. One of the first major post-war apartment projects was The Victoria on Queen Anne. The architect, John Graham, Sr., announced it with great fanfare in May 1921, saying that construction of the "mammoth community apartment house" indicated a "fast reviving building situation in Seattle...the first important answer to the

campaign waged by the Chamber of Commerce to get the public to build now." Graham went on to predict "there will be a great influx of people to Seattle seeking homes this fall. We are following what we have been teaching: build now. It is especially needed."[46] However, the building was not completed until 1923. It set a high standard among Seattle apartments, as its units averaged more than 1200 square feet, and many had fireplaces, large foyers, libraries. A children's play area and servants' rooms were in the basement. A number of other buildings with similar amenities were built over the next decade.

Minority groups played a particularly important role in hotel and apartment development during this period. Both Asians and African-Americans were constrained from owning property and living where they wished, so they often lived in apartments or apartment hotels. Residential hotels were a particularly important part of the social and economic life of Japanese and Chinese residents. In 1930 there were 136 Japanese-owned hotels and a separate Japanese Hotel Owners Association. Hotels were the major employer of Japanese residents.[47]

The city had relatively few African-Americans before World War II (3,789 in 1940), but they owned or managed several hotels and apartment buildings. William Grose, one of the city's first African-Americans, owned the Our House Hotel near First Avenue and Yesler Way, and in 1882 purchased land off of East Madison Street. This became a

---

[46] *Seattle Times*, May 15, 1921.
[47] Richard C. Berner, *Seattle 1921-1940 from Boom to Bust*, (Seattle: Charles Press,1992), p. 212.

center for the black community and in the 1920s there were thirty black-owned buildings in the general vicinity of East Madison Street and 23rd Avenue, including the Chandler Apartments and Annex, the Dunbar Hotel, the Adelphi Apartments and the Douglass Apartments.[48] African-Americans were also an important part of the staffs of the larger downtown hotels and apartment hotels that catered to the wealthy and middle classes.

Apartments as Home: Controlled Intensive Development: 1924 - 1957

By the early 1920s, apartments were well established as a viable and acceptable housing option for the middle class, typically for single people or for those saving to buy a single-family home. The market continued to evolve over the next three decades, with strong growth except during the Depression. Beginning in 1923, the city took various actions to control development that significantly influenced the form and location of apartments.

With the economic prosperity of the 1920s, apartments competed in offering amenities and luxuries that made them worthwhile alternatives to a single-family house. While this had been true to some extent in the preceding years, it became more common in the 1920s. The trend continued during the 1930s and into the 1950s, for very different reasons. The Depression halted apartment development, but also forced many homeowners into apartments. This occurred at all economic levels, as even some

[48] Jacqueline E. A. Lawson, "Let's Take A Walk," 2005.

wealthy people (particularly widows) downsized by moving from their large houses into luxurious apartments. The critical housing shortage during World War II and in the post-war era further increased the importance of apartments as a housing option.
In 1923 the City of Seattle became one of the first U. S. cities to adopt a comprehensive zoning ordinance to regulate land uses. This ordinance determined, for the first time, the location and form of new apartment buildings. The complex ordinance divided residential areas into First Residential (where only single-family residences were allowed) and Second Residential, where apartment buildings were allowed. The location of each zone was determined primarily by the existing uses and character of each area. Thus, the Second Residential zone was located in a ring around downtown that already had many apartments (Belltown, First Hill, and western Capitol Hill) and adjoining commercial uses along the neighborhood arterials. Overlaid on the use zones were four Area Districts that regulated setbacks, lot coverage and building bulk. In addition, there were five overlaid Height Districts that determined allowable heights. Further apartment development was prohibited in single family areas, but it was allowed in commercial zones, where larger buildings were possible.[49]

This zoning change was enacted just as the city was beginning a significant development phase. Population growth slowed from previous decades, increasing by only 16 percent, from 315,312 in 1920 to 365,583 in 1930. However, the strong economy and pent-up demand for housing and commercial and institutional buildings meant that downtown was transformed with large office buildings and hotels, neighborhoods gained new

[49] City of Seattle, Multifamily Land Use Policies, p. 20

commercial districts and large residential areas, and apartment buildings were constructed throughout the city. The value of building permits issued between 1921 and 1930 equaled 48 percent of the value of all construction between 1921 and 1940.[50] The increased popularity of the automobile made people less dependent on streetcars, and development spread out accordingly. The city limits extended to approximately N. 85th Street (NE 65th Street in the northeast), and by the end of the 1920s much of the city's land area was developed with residential suburbs.

The *Journal of Commerce* reported record amounts of construction in 1925, including "thousands of houses and scores of apartment houses." The strong economy and construction activities led to higher wages and a growing demand for housing. Both construction and population growth came to a standstill in the 1930s.[51] Multifamily development peaked in 1925 and continued strongly until 1929-30.[52] The majority of the city's pre-World War II apartments were built during this period. Apartment blocks appeared along arterials in nearly every neighborhood. Many courtyard apartments were also constructed, with landscaped courtyards for residents to enjoy. While most buildings had predominantly one-bedroom or efficiency units, some buildings had larger apartments with amenities such as fireplaces.

---

[50] Calvin Schmid, *Social Trends in Seattle*. Seattle:, University of Washington Press, 1944, p. 33.
[51] Berner, *Seattle 1921-1940*, pp. 181-183.
[52] Schmid, *Social Trends in Seattle*, p. 34.

Seattle was hit as hard as any city by the Depression of the 1930s. After decades of growth, the population increase virtually stopped. The 1940 population of 368,302 was only one percent greater than the 365,583 people in the city in 1930. Residential construction dropped precipitously, from 2,583 units in 1930 to 361 units in 1932, with an even greater drop in multifamily development, which continued to be erratic through the rest of the Depression.[53]

Despite the intensive apartment development of the 1920s, Seattle was known as a haven for homeowners. In 1941 the Works Progress Administration guide to Washington noted: "Among cities of the Nation with a population of 300,000 or more, Seattle ranks third in the percentage of home ownership....Scattered throughout the city are many districts of middle income...five- to seven-room dwellings cover an unusual proportion of the city's space....Moderately priced apartment houses and hotels loom here and there among the low roofs of the cottages....immediately south of the business district...rooming houses and cheap hotels provide lodging for large numbers of itinerant and seasonal laborers."[54]

Few major commercial or government projects occurred during the Depression, other than those sponsored by the federal government. Major projects completed in the 1930s include a new federal office building, a courthouse, an armory and the Sand Point Naval Air Station. The Works Progress Administration and other New Deal projects also

[53] Berner, *Seattle 1921-1940*, p. 181.
[54] Washington Writers' Project, *Washington: A Guide to the Evergreen State* (Portland: Binford & Mort, 1941), p. 212-213.

completed improvements to parks, streets, sidewalks and sewer systems. One highlight was in the University District, where the business community joined together in 1932 to construct the Edmond Meany Hotel, a facility that served both travelers and permanent residents.

Major transportation improvements had significant and long-lasting implications for the area's development and housing. The completion of the Aurora Bridge in 1932 made it considerably easier for automobiles to enter downtown Seattle, encouraging more single-family development north of the city limits at 85th Street. The growing influence of automobiles was made clear in 1940 when the city halted the trolleys, which had been losing money since even before the city's acquisition of the system in 1918, and replaced them with a bus system. The same year, the opening of the Lacey V. Murrow Floating Bridge enabled people, for the first time, to commute easily from the large undeveloped areas east of Lake Washington to downtown Seattle. Earlier commuters had to rely on ferry service.

In 1939 Britain placed a large order for Boeing B-17's, and Seattle began its wartime transformation, the most important in its history. The city was well situated to play a critical role, with its shipyards, Boeing plants and related industries that were crucial to arming the Allies. Its large protected port and proximity to Alaska and Japan meant that it served as a major point for shipping supplies and for training and embarkation of troops. At Boeing alone, employment increased from 4,000 in September 1939 to 30,000 by December 1941. It was said that no state was more affected economically by the

expansion of war industries than was Washington.[55] The city was one among the top three in the country in terms of military contracts per capita, and its population exploded from 368,302 in 1940 to 480,000 in 1943.[56]

The tremendous growth of the war years stressed Seattle in every way, particularly through the need to house more than 50,000 defense workers and their families who came to the city. Defense needs limited the availability of building materials, so relatively little private permanent new construction occurred. Advertising campaigns, sometimes going door-to-door, encouraged people to welcome lodgers into their homes. Federal home loans enabled homeowners to convert portions of their homes for renters, and the city relaxed building regulations to encourage the addition of rental units in homes and the conversion of vacant commercial buildings to housing. It is estimated that 3,000 temporary units were produced.[57] Units were also obtained through the rehabilitation of hotels and apartment buildings, especially downtown and in Pioneer Square that had become dilapidated during the Depression.[58] Not surprisingly, rents (especially for small units and rooming houses) increased significantly and the federal government made efforts to control rents. However, the controls were loosened after local protests, which found that three-quarters of local apartments were owned by individual owners rather than large corporations.[59]

---

[55] Crowley, *Timeline*, p. 59.
[56] Andrews, *Pioneer Square*. p. 129.
[57] Berner, *Seattle Transformed*, pp. 91-94.
[58] Andrews, *Pioneer Square*, p. 129.
[59] Berner, *Seattle Transformed*, pp. 91-94.

Another wartime response to the housing shortage was the construction of 6,000 housing units by the federal government in partnership with the Seattle Housing Authority. Most projects were located near Boeing or the shipyards and steel plants of the Duwamish area, or the military bases at Sand Point, Fort Lawton and Pier 91. The great majority were temporary projects, including dormitories and trailer parks, long forgotten today. However, the five permanent garden apartment communities had a lasting impact on the city. Each of these had numerous small buildings, most housing two to four families, sited along landscaped curvilinear roadways. The first of these projects, Yesler Terrace, was initiated as a New Deal urban renewal project, but was converted to defense housing by the time of its completion. It and the three communities of High Point, Holly Park and Rainier Vista became low-income housing after the war. A fifth project, adjacent to the Sand Point Naval Air Station, was sold to the University of Washington in 1956 for graduate student housing. Local architects teamed up to design these projects, as there was little work available.[60] (All of these projects except Yesler Terrace have been demolished in recent years.)

The acute demand for housing continued with the end of the war. Many of those who had seen the Pacific Northwest while on military service wanted to return, and families that had been separated by the war wanted to establish homes. However, a shortage of building materials and of skilled labor, combined with continued federal control and a post-war recession, slowed development initially. Low-interest loans insured by the

[60] Mimi Sheridan, Seattle Landmark Nomination Form, Rainier Vista Homes, 2000.

Federal Housing Administration spurred development of both suburban single-family houses and large multifamily projects in the city. It was estimated that 70 percent of apartment development in 1949 was covered by FHA mortgage insurance, which transferred the development risk from the private builder to the federal agency. These apartments were primarily in large complexes of 100 units or more, a distinct departure from earlier trends. Projects were typically built to the minimum standards established by FHA, as there was little reason to build larger or better appointed units than required.[61] Apartment construction, like single-family construction, dispersed away from the downtown. With the availability of the automobile, people no longer depended on buses. The completion of the Lake Washington Bridge in 1940 allowed builders to build farther out to the east where land was cheaper. This occurred even within Seattle, with more multifamily development in the north end and West Seattle, which were made more easily accessible by the completion of the Alaskan Way Viaduct in the early 1950s.

Federal mortgage insurance also encouraged the development of privately-owned apartment complexes, which often consisted of a grouping of multi-unit, multi-story buildings arranged in a landscaped setting. These extended the bungalow court's concept of a setting apart from the street, but they were larger in scale, with higher densities and larger buildings, usually without individual entries for each unit. The earliest known local example is Edgewater Park (now the Edgewater Apartments). The eighteen buildings (with a total of 305 units) are arranged around large courtyards on

[61] "Apartment Boom," *Architectural Forum*, January 1950, p. 95.

the 12.5-acre lakefront site in the Madison Park neighborhood. It was built by local businessmen organized as the Madison Park Corporation in 1938-40, about the same time as the Yesler Terrace public housing project. The project was financed by a $1,250,000 mortgage loan insured by the Federal Housing Administration.[62] Edgewater Park's architect, John Graham, Jr., had recently returned from working in New York City, where this form of garden apartment had become highly developed and very popular.

At least three similar projects were built in the late 1940s-early 1950s, probably to house the influx of university students brought by the G. I. bill:

- Laurelon Terrace (originally called Laurelon Gardens), off Sand Point Way near the University of Washington, has 136 units in 19 two-story buildings, arranged on a 5.5 acre site.
- Northgate Plaza, across from Northgate Mall, was designed by John Graham, Jr. (architect for the mall) and includes 207 units in 34 buildings.
- Wedgewood Estates (originally called Oneida Gardens) was built in a new neighborhood north of the University of Washington in 1947-48, with 110 units in eleven buildings; in the 1970s three buildings were added, reducing the open space.[63]

Apartment buildings constructed in the decade after World War II typically continued the same building forms as those used in the 1920s, with the apartment block being the most popular. Courtyard or townhouse developments from the period are uncommon,

[62] "Madison Park Project Waits City Approval," *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, June 9, 1938.
[63] Department of Planning and Development building records

although they do exist. By the mid-1950s, garages became a more predominant design element, with garage doors or open car ports on the primary façade. Also at this time a new form became popular, multistory buildings with apartment units opening off of exterior corridors. Building circulation was often clearly identified, with a stair tower as the primary feature of a façade. Fenestration was often concentrated on certain elevations, leaving blank facades that served as a background for fanciful over-sized signs announcing the apartment building's name. [64]

Most post-war buildings were Modernistic in style, with flat roofs (often with deep eaves), little or no ornamentation and larger expanses of glass than seen in earlier buildings. They used modern materials such as Roman brick and aluminum framed windows. Wide horizontal wood siding, stone (or manufactured stone) and various types of stucco and Marblecrete were also commonly seen on. Concrete block (CMU) was used not only as a structural element, but in decorative patterns and as screening.

Postscript: Development after 1957

In 1957 the City of Seattle completed a comprehensive review of its zoning ordinance, leading to significant changes in the location and form of apartment buildings. The city had changed significantly since the 1923 ordinance had been enacted. It had grown by nearly 70 percent, from 325,000 in 1923 to 550,000 in 1957. Its land area had increased

[64] Amanda Lewkowicz, "Capitol Hill's Modern Apartment Buildings: An Investigation in the Dingbat Typology," Unpublished paper, Urbdp 585, University of Washington, June 2008.

from approximately 70 to 92 square miles, due to the annexation in 1954 of all the land up to North 145th Street. However, the average household size in the city was decreasing. One reason for this was the growing popularity of apartment living. At the beginning of the century more than five people (5.64) had lived in each household. This fell steadily over the next decades: 3.94 in 1920 before the apartment construction boom; 2.91 in 1940, just before the wartime housing shortage; and then to 2.79 in 1950, reflecting, in part, the early movement of families to larger suburban houses.[65]

The new zoning ordinance was based on the philosophy of encouraging a standardized land use pattern for each neighborhood, with single-family residences ringed by arterials, with commercial and multifamily uses concentrated near the arterials. The new zones placed greater restrictions on land uses to avoid potential conflicts. Only two zones allowed apartment buildings: a low-density zone for 2-to-3-story walk-ups and garden court buildings (RM800); and another zone for taller elevator buildings (RMH350). Each zone had additional regulations for building bulk, lot coverage, minimum lot sizes and square footage required per unit. A new provision allowed larger projects to develop as "Planned Unit Developments," without adhering to individual lot sizes. Higher densities (and heights up to 60 feet) were still allowed in commercial zones, intensifying the earlier tendency to place apartment buildings in commercial districts.[66]

---

[65] City of Seattle Multifamily Policies, p. 20.
[66] City of Seattle Multifamily Policies, p. 22.

The ordinance's most significant change for apartment buildings was a new parking requirement. The ratio of cars in the city had risen to 1.438 per household. Although some apartments had provided automobile facilities since the early 1920s, it had not been required, and the number of parking spaces was generally less than one per unit. The new regulations required three parking spaces for each four units in smaller buildings (RM 800 zone). In the higher-density zone, one space was required for each two units up to the first fifty units, and an additional space for each unit above fifty. This requirement meant that a developer had to provide additional space for cars, usually on ground level along the front of the building. The streets came to be lined with garages, open parking and curb cuts.[67]

DEVELOPERS AND ARCHITECTS

The Developers

The character of early apartment buildings, as well as their size, location and the timing of their construction, was determined primarily by developers and their financial backers. Many Seattle apartment buildings in the study period appear to have been developed by individuals or partnerships to be maintained as rental properties. Others were constructed for sale to investors shortly after completion. Larger projects were financed by investment firms. Most individuals, partnerships or corporate entities appear to have been involved in only a small number of buildings, although the identities of the specific persons involved in a particular building is sometimes difficult

[67] City of Seattle Multifamily Policies, p. 22.

to determine. However, several individuals have been identified as having played a significant role in shaping the Seattle apartment landscape of the period.

Frederick Anhalt (1896-1996) was Seattle's best-known apartment developer, bringing a distinctive sense of style and promoting high-quality apartments as an alternative to single-family homes. Today, his buildings are seen as setting the standard for pre-war apartment buildings and have become almost synonymous with the type. Anhalt was only involved with apartment development for approximately five years (1925-1930), and worked through at least three different business entities in that time. His approach was to combine the development, design, construction, landscaping, marketing and management functions in one firm. Anhalt moved to Seattle about 1924 after working in various trades in the Midwest, and in 1925 formed the Western Building & Leasing Company with partner Jerome B. Hardcastle, Jr.[68] The company quickly began to centralize both design and construction within the firm, and built bungalow courts, apartment courts and small commercial buildings on Capitol Hill, Queen Anne, West Seattle, Beacon Hill and Ballard. In 1928 Anhalt bought Hardcastle's interest, and designed and constructed apartment buildings for The Borchert Company (owned by Anhalt's brother-in-law). The following year the firm (then known as the Anhalt Company) decided to increase profits by focusing on the higher end market with elaborate Tudor and Norman French courtyard apartments. In 1929-1930 he built his best known projects, five luxury apartment buildings on Capitol Hill, based on Medieval

[68] Hardcastle also developed apartment buildings on his own, both during and after his partnership with Anhalt.

English and Norman French prototypes. Although the apartment business failed during the Depression, Anhalt was involved in single-family construction until 1942, when he turned his focus to a plant nursery business.

Anhalt's later buildings are particularly notable because of his goal of creating "apartment homes," refuges that were distinguished by their charm, fanciful detailing (exterior and interior) and quality landscaping. Although he used architects to complete his designs, Anhalt himself was very influential in freely combining elements such as steeply-pitched roofs, turrets, gables, dormers with highly decorative elements such as clinker brick, leaded and stained glass to produce the buildings that have come to be considered the epitome of the 1920s apartment building in Seattle.[69]

Gardner J. Gwinn may have been Seattle's most prolific apartment developer of the pre-World War II period. His firm, Gardner Gwinn, Inc., was widely advertised as "Builder of apartments, homes, bungalow courts and commercial buildings—designed, built and financed."[70] Gwinn began doing construction work with his father in his native Nova Scotia, moving to Seattle in 1909. He soon established his own construction business, building more than 700 homes ranging in value from $5,000 to $25,000. They were noted for their livability and strong construction. In 1925 he turned primarily to apartment construction, building more than fifty apartment houses during the 1925-30

---

[69] Lawrence Kreisman, *Apartments by Anhalt* (Seattle: City of Seattle Office of Urban Conservation, 1982), p. 6

[70] *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, January 3, 1926.

development boom. He typically sold buildings to investors shortly after completion, using the funds for new projects. His largest project was the 14-story Benjamin Franklin Hotel, the second largest in Seattle (demolished for construction of the present Westin Hotel). His brother Wells Gwinn headed several housing contracting and finance companies.

Gwinn's buildings represent the "bread and butter" of Seattle apartments. They feature quality construction, but are basically wood frame blocks of 3-4 stories, clad with brick veneer with applied terra cotta ornament. They are ubiquitous on Capitol Hill and lower Queen Anne and found in several other neighborhoods as well. Gwinn himself is listed as the architect on some building plans, and it is probable that many of the buildings were adapted from a master design by in-house draftsmen, differentiated simply by changes in the applied terra cotta ornament.

John S. Hudson (b. 1879) developed apartments primarily on Capitol Hill and First Hill between 1923 and 1928. He came to Seattle in 1903 from his native Minnesota. He began studying architecture in 1910 and obtained his architecture license in 1921, but he worked primarily as a developer.[71] He is known to have been involved in at least a dozen buildings. The names of many of his buildings generally refer to American history--the John Alden, Paul Revere, John Winthrop, Hudson Arms, Lexington-Concord, Faneuil Hall, Lowell and Emerson. Others are the Hudson Arms, Chasselton,

[71] Clarence Bagley, *History of Seattle*, Seattle: Pioneer Publishing Company, 1916, pp. 64-68.

Northcliffe, Miramar, Loleta, Rhododendron and Ruth Court. His brother Harry Hudson designed many of these buildings.

Samuel Anderson (1884-1959) was primarily a builder of single-family homes who entered the apartment field in the late 1920s. Anderson came to Seattle from Wisconsin in 1906 and became very active in the home building industry as an organizer and official of the Seattle Master Builders Association and related national organizations.[72] In 1928-29 he developed at least eight Seattle apartment buildings, notable for their vivid interpretations of a wide variety of styles. Seven of the buildings that have been identified are in the 1100 block of 17th Avenue.[73] An additional one (La Flor) is several blocks away on Capitol Hill. They are all basic three-story rectangular forms with central entrances, with 14 to 16 units ranging from 660 to 900 square feet in size. The applied ornament and architectural detailing on the facades is very striking and expressive, drawing from the Art Deco, Colonial, Mediterranean Revival, French Provincial and Tudor Revival styles. Each building has its own individualized landscaping. The scale is very domestic, giving the street the feel of a neighborhood of larger than average single-family houses.

Edward L. Merritt was another single-family developer who turned to apartment development in the 1920s. Unlike other developers, he was an architect, having graduated from the University of Minnesota architectural school in 1900. He joined his

---

[72] *Seattle Times*, Samuel Anderson obituary, April 4, 1959.

[73] Two additional buildings in this group were designed by Schack & Young for different owners. The relationship, if any, between them and Anderson is not known.

father's Seattle contracting business before forming the Merritt-Hall Investment Company. In 1917 he purchased the Craftsman Bungalow Company and built showcase houses throughout the city. In the mid-twenties he opened the Merritt Realty Company and developed several apartment buildings.[74]

Angus P. Malloy was a major force in the development of the University District. He came to Seattle from Florida for the Alaska-Pacific-Yukon Exposition in 1909 and became a prominent local businessman. Malloy purchased the Adelaide Apartments in 1925 and, the following year, bought Washington Manor Apartments, renaming it Malloy Manor. In 1928 he built the Malloy Apartments, designed by Earl Roberts, adjacent to campus.

The Architects

Apartment design in the first half of the 20th century attracted some of the city's best architects, who were responsible for many major buildings as well as apartments. Many projects, however, were designed by architects who specialized in apartment design. Apartment plans were also available in catalogs, although it is not known how many of those that were actually constructed began as catalog designs.

William Bain, Sr. and **Lionel Pries** each had a long distinguished career, but they worked together on apartment buildings during their brief partnership (1928-1932).

---

[74] David Vergobbi, *Seattle Master Builders: An 80 Year Journey Through History*, Bellevue WA: SMBA, 1989, p. 42.

Bain (1896-1985) was one of the city's best-known and most prolific architects for much of the 20th century. He came to Seattle in 1915, apprenticing with W. R. B. Willcox and Arthur Loveless before serving in the U. S. Army in World War I. In 1921 he received a degree in architecture from the University of Pennsylvania, receiving further training in the Beaux-Arts tradition. He opened his own practice in 1924, specializing in houses in the French and English Revival styles. From 1928 until 1932 he was in partnership with Lionel Pries, and designed a number of apartments and sorority houses that exhibit both Revival and Modern influences. One of his first apartment buildings, the Shoremont (1926) showed French Provincial influences. Three later apartment designs with Pries show Georgian Revival influences: the Viceroy (1930), the Consulate (1930) and the Envoy (1930). The partners also designed an addition to the Shoremont (1930-31). Their most notable apartment design is the Bel-Roy (1930-31), which departed from the typical block form to express its Moderne style in a zigzag floor plan.

Following the partnership's dissolution, Bain continued with residential and apartment commissions and added commercial and institutional work. Toward the end of the Depression, Bain joined other local architects in working on the Yesler Terrace public housing project. During World War II he served as state camouflage director, gaining some fame as the person responsible for disguising the Boeing plant. In 1943 he formed a partnership with three other architects, with whom he remained until his death. This firm, now known as NBBJ, has grown into one of the largest architectural firms in the

world. He also continued with residential designs with another partner, Harrison Overturf, combining traditional and modern idioms.[75]

Lionel Pries was at the University of Pennsylvania at the same time as Bain, receiving a master's of architecture in 1921. He had previously studied at the University of California. Following graduation, he studied in Europe and later opened a private practice in San Francisco. He came to Seattle in 1928 and formed a partnership with Bain, as described above. Following the partnership with Bain, Pries taught full-time at the University of Washington School of Architecture, rising to full professor in 1948. He remained there until 1958, and is known for his brilliant teaching and lasting influence on his students.[76]

Everett J. Beardsley is best known for his elegant Mediterranean Revival apartment designs. Little is known of his life, although he arrived in Seattle in 1909. He worked with a number of developers, and designed the Hacienda Court (1925), the Morris Apartments (1926), El Monterey (1928), Villa Costella (1928) and El Cerrito (1930).[77]

Henry Bittman (1882-1953) studied engineering at Cooper Union in New York and worked briefly as a bridge engineer in Chicago before arriving in Seattle in 1906. He practiced for a year with architect William Kingsley, and then opened his own practice

---

[75] Jeffrey Ochsner, editor, *Shaping Seattle Architecture: A Guide to the Architects* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998), pp. 216-219.
[76] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture*, pp. 228-233.
[77] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture* p. 338.

designing structural steel skeletons for the large buildings that were beginning to appear. He became a licensed architect in 1923, beginning with several apartment commissions, including the Davenport (1924), the Devonshire (1925), the Windham (1925) and the Stockbridge (1925). However, he primarily designed larger buildings such as the Terminal Sales Building (1923) and the United Shopping Tower (now the Olympic Tower, 1928-31). He is best known for his sumptuous use of terra cotta ornament, as seen in the Eagles Temple (now ACT Theater, 1925), the Music Box Theater (1928, demolished), and the Embassy Theater/Mann Building (1926). Toward the end of his long career he turned to the Streamlined Moderne and International styles, evidenced by the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* Building (now Group Health, 1947).[78]

John Creutzer (d. 1929) first practiced architecture in Minneapolis before moving on to Spokane and then to Seattle in 1906. He worked as a designer and construction supervisor for Alexander Pearson, a contractor and for Henderson Ryan, a prominent architect. His major projects include the Swedish Tabernacle (1906) and the Medical-Dental Building (1927, with A. H. Albertson). His apartment designs include Carolina Court (1915), the Lenawee (1918), the Charbern (1925), Park Vista (1928) and the Julie (now the El Rio, 1929).[79]

Edwin E. Dofsen (1902-1976) began his career as a self-taught draftsman who apprenticed with various Seattle architectural offices. In 1927 he joined the Anhalt Company. He did plans for fourteen of Anhalt's apartment buildings, including the

[78] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture* , pp. 192-196.
[79] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture* p. 341.

best-known ones that best express the highly-detailed Norman style favored by Anhalt. His works include Oak Manor (1929), Twin Gables (1929), 417 Harvard East (1929), Belmont Court (1929), 1014. E. Roy (1930) and 1005 E. Roy (1930). Dofsen later formed his own company with engineer Charles A. Tiffany and designed more than forty residences in the Seattle area, mostly colonial or contemporary in style.[80]

Robert L. Durham (1912-1998) is best known for his church designs, but also had a substantial apartment practice early in his career. A Seattle native, he was educated at the College of Puget Sound and graduated from the University of Washington School of Architecture in 1936. Durham first worked as a draftsman for B. Dudley Stuart, a noted apartment architect, and then with the Federal Housing Administration. He rejoined Stuart in the firm of Stuart and Durham from 1941 to 1951. During this period the firm completed several apartment designs, including the notable Queen Vista (1949) and Aloha Terrace (1947) on Queen Anne and the Laurelon Terrace complex in Laurelhurst. Following Stuart's retirement and a brief period of independent practice, he formed the firm of Durham Anderson and Freed. They designed many churches, including the Fauntleroy Congregational Church, which received a national AIA Honor Award in 1952. Although they were not known specifically for apartment work, they did do at least two high-rise buildings, the award-winning Skyline House on Queen Anne (1956) and Horizon House (1971) on First Hill. The firm was also heavily involved in civic and institutional projects and commercial buildings such as Fire Station No. 5 (1963), the Southwest Branch Seattle Library (1961), the University of Washington Atmospheric

[80] Kreisman, *Apartments by Anhalt*, pp. 11-12.

Sciences Building (1970) and the Evergreen State College library and master plan (1971). Durham was very involved in the architectural community, serving as the president of the Seattle AIA chapter, the Washington State chapter (1954) and as national AIA board member and then President (1967-68). He was inducted into the College of Fellows in 1959 and received the AIA Seattle Medal for lifetime achievement in 1985.[81]

John Graham, Sr. (1873-1955) is one of Seattle's best known architects. He apprenticed as an architect in his native England and moved to Seattle in 1901. His long career, extending until the 1940s, embraced a wide variety of styles and building types, including many of the city's most important buildings. Several of these were apartments and hotels. His early partnership with David Myers was responsible for the Algonquin Apartments (now the Helen V, 1907). He opened his own practice in 1910 and designed the Rector Hotel (now the St. Charles, 1911), the NP Hotel (1914) and the McKay Apartment Hotel (1914, demolished). His outstanding apartment design is the large Victoria Apartments (1921), prominently sited on Queen Anne. In 1929 he turned to the Art Deco style for the Roosevelt Hotel. Other noted works were the Frederick & Nelson Building (now Nordstrom, 1916-19), the Dexter-Horton Building (1921-24), the Exchange Building (1929-31), the Bon Marché (1928-29), and the U. S. Marine Hospital (1931-34).[82]

---

[81] DoCoMoMoWeWa.org; http://aiaseattle.org/archive_honors_medal85_durham.htm
[82] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture* pp. 90-93.

John Graham, Jr. (1908-1991), the son of John Graham, Sr., is best known today for shopping center and commercial designs, but he designed several apartment complexes early in his career. He was born in Seattle and attended the University of Washington before transferring to Yale University, from which he received a degree in fine arts in 1931. He remained on the East Coast working in merchandising until 1937, when he opened a New York office of his father's firm. The office specialized in department store work, but also designed a number of large federally-financed housing projects. In 1938-40, Graham applied this experience locally, designing Edgewater Park, an 18-building, 305 unit complex on the shores of Lake Washington in Madison Park.

Following World War II, Graham capitalized on his large-scale retail design and planning experience by teaming up with the president of the local Bon Marché department store to develop Northgate Shopping Center (1946-50), the first of its kind in the country. Across the street, Graham designed the Northgate Plaza apartments, a complex of 34 buildings containing 207 apartments. Northgate's success lead to the design of nearly 70 regional shopping centers, including Ala Moana in Honolulu (1960) and Lloyd Center (1960) and Clackamas Town Center (1981) in the Portland area. The firm also designed (and sometimes developed) many large commercial buildings and hospitals including, in Seattle alone, the Bank of California building (1971-74), the Westin Hotel (1979-82), the Sheraton Hotel (1978-82) and 1600 Bell Plaza (1976).

However, Graham's best known work is the Space Needle (1961), designed in collaboration with Victor Steinbreuck.[83]

J. Lister Holmes (1891-1986) had an eclectic practice with numerous large single family homes as well as housing projects and institutional buildings. He received his degree in architecture from the University of Pennsylvania in 1913 and returned to Seattle to work for several firms before establishing his own practice in 1922. Holmes designed residences and fraternity houses in a range of architectural idioms, including English Tudor, Spanish Colonial, Norman Provincial and 18th century French. One of his early projects, in 1924, was the William Tell Hotel (now apartments), a small highly detailed Mediterranean Revival building. Soon afterwards he designed the mid-rise Sovereign (1925). During the Depression he began designing houses in the newly-developed International Style and served as the chief architect for the Seattle Housing Authority's first public housing project, Yesler Terrace. He later worked on temporary housing projects at Gatewood Heights and Seward Park. After the war, he resumed his residential practice, as well as doing institutional buildings such as the Seattle Public Schools Administrative Building and Catherine Blaine Elementary School.[84]

Harry E. Hudson primarily did designs for his brother, John Hudson, one of the major apartment developers in the Capitol Hill/First Hill area. The Hudsons came to Seattle from Minnesota and most of their buildings were named for the heroes of American history and literature. Hudson's major works are the adjacent high-rise buildings on

[83] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture* pp. 258-262.
[84] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture*, pp. 204-209.

First Hill, the Lowell and the Emerson (1928). Nearby are the Paul Revere (1924), the John Alden (1924), the John Winthrop (1925), and Faneuil Hall (1928). In Belltown is the twin Lexington-Concord building.[85] He also designed a house for James A. Gibbs, his brother's development partner in the firm Gibbs and Hudson. The terra cotta-clad house, a Seattle historic landmark located on Queen Anne hill, was reportedly modeled after the Albert Rhodes mansion on Capitol Hill, designed by A. W. Gould.

Daniel Huntington (1871-1962), one of Seattle's most prominent architects, is best known for his city institutions, but he also designed several apartment and hotel buildings. He was originally from New Jersey, but began his architectural career in Denver in 1889. After work in New York and again in Denver, he arrived in Seattle about 1904 and in 1907 formed a partnership with James Schack. Huntington later worked with Carl Gould and Arthur Loveless, designing numerous residences and commercial buildings with each firm. His most important role was as City of Seattle architect from 1912 until 1921, during which period he designed the Lake Union Steam Plant and at least ten fire stations and libraries, many of which are listed in the National Register or are designated local landmarks. He later became known for apartments, schools and institutional buildings. Early in his career he designed the Arctic Club (now the Morrison Hotel) and the De la Mar apartments (1908). Following his city career, he designed the Northcliffe Apartments (1924) and, with Archibald Torbitt, the Piedmont Apartment Hotel (now part of the Tuscany, 1928).[86]

---

[85] Building records, Seattle Department of Planning & Development.
[86] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture* pp. 114-119.

George W. Lawton (1863-1928), born in Wisconsin, came to Seattle about the time of the Great Fire in 1889. He worked as a draftsman for the prominent firm of Saunders & Houghton before entering into partnership with Charles Saunders in 1898. The firm designed a wide range of projects, including the Lincoln Apartment Hotel, one of the city's first apartment blocks, the San Marco (1905) and the Summit (1910). They adeptly used a wide range of revival styles, including Romanesque, Classical, Tudor and Colonial. One of their most noted works was the Forestry Building (1908-09) at the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, a classical design executed in raw logs. Few of these early buildings remain, other than Horace Mann and Beacon Hill (now El Centro de la Raza) elementary schools. The partnership dissolved in 1915. As an independent practitioner, Lawton worked with A. W. Gould on the Arctic Building (1913-17), famed for its terra cotta walrus heads. In 1922 Lawton formed a partnership with Herman A. Moldenhour (1864-1976). Moldenhour, also from Wisconsin, had been an office boy for the Saunders & Lawton firm. This partnership specialized in large office and apartment buildings, including the Franklin (1918), the Castle (1918), Olive Crest (1924) and Hawthorne Square (1924), a notable townhouse project. Moldenhour continued with an independent practice after Lawton's death in 1928.[87]

Blaine McCool (1923-2006) was one of Seattle's most prolific apartment designers of the 1950s-60s. McCool was born in Idaho in 1923 and served as a pilot in the Army Air Force during World War II. Following the war he initially studied architecture at the

[87] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture* p. 347.

University of Washington but later received his certificate in architectural drafting from Edison Technical School in 1950. He worked at Eckert-Tiffany & Associates in Seattle and then formed a partnership with Charles Morgan in 1958.[88] He later practiced on his own, including extensive work in Alaska. He designed numerous Modernist apartment buildings in the Capitol Hill, Queen Anne and University neighborhoods. McCool died in 2006.

Earl W. Morrison (d. 1955) practiced in Spokane before moving to Seattle in 1926. He specialized in high-rise buildings, especially apartments. His major works include the Olive Tower Apartments (1928), 1223 Spring Street Apartments (1929), the Gainsborough (1930), the Marlborough (1926) and the Nettleton (now 1000 8th Avenue Apartments, 1949).[89]

Earl Roberts practiced architecture in Seattle in the 1920s-30s, and is known primarily for his apartment buildings. He is most noted for his numerous works in the University District, mostly high-rises. These include the Commodore (1925), the Duchess (1925), the Stanford (1924), Washington Manor (now University Manor, 1926) and the Malloy (1928).[90]

Henderson Ryan (b. 1878) arrived in Seattle in 1898 after attending the University of Kentucky. He first worked as a contractor-builder, but opened his own architectural

[88] Architecture License file, Blaine McCool, Washington Department of Licensing.
[89] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture* p. 349.
[90] Building records, Seattle Department of Planning & Development

practice in 1900. His first notable work was Ballard's Carnegie library (1903-04). He then embarked on a series of apartment house designs, including the Waldorf Hotel (1905-06, demolished), the Roycroft (1907), and the Fredonia (1908). His most significant apartment design is the Maryland (1910-11), a designated Seattle historic landmark. Numerous other apartments and other structures have been attributed to Ryan, most of which do not survive: the 11-story Raleigh Hotel, the Antonia Apartments, the Taylor, the Keene Apartments, the Broadway Building and the Moore Building. He also had a large residential practice. His career turned to theater design with the Liberty Theater (1912, demolished) and the Neptune Theater (1921-22). For the Liberty he originated and patented a new ramp design that provided easy balcony access while maximizing auditorium space. This innovation evidently led to commissions for theaters in Butte and Helena, Montana, and elsewhere throughout the country. He moved to California in 1923, perhaps to continue his work in theater design.[91]

James H. Schack (1871-1933), a German native, arrived in Seattle in 1901 after receiving architectural training at various Chicago firms. One of his early local works was the Savoy Hotel (1906). He was a partner of Daniel Huntington from 1907-09, primarily designing apartments, commercial buildings and residences as well as the First United Methodist Church (1907-10) in downtown Seattle. He is best known, however, for his later partnership with David Meyers and Arrigo Young, which began in 1920. The firm designed the Seattle Civic Auditorium complex (1925-26), the town of Longview and

[91] Mimi Sheridan, "The Waldorf Hotel: History and Photo Documentation," Washington State Trade and Convention Center, 2000.

numerous residences and commercial buildings.[92] After Myers left the firm in 1929, Schack and Young specialized in apartment design, producing some of the city's most notable Art Deco apartment buildings. These include the Margola (1928), the Martha Anne (1928), the Baroness Apartment Hotel (1931), and the Ward (1931).

B. Dudley Stuart (1885-1977) was born in London and practiced in Edmonton and Vancouver before arriving in Seattle in 1918. His partnership with Arthur Wheatley (1925-30) specialized in larger apartment buildings, including the Biltmore (1924), the Highland (1924), the Exeter Hotel (now Exeter House, 1927), the Bergonian (now the Mayflower Park Hotel, 1927) and the smaller Marianne apartments (1930) on Queen Anne. During World War II he practiced with two pioneering Modernist architects, Paul Hayden Kirk and Robert Durham. After the war, he continued developing apartment designs with Durham, until 1977. These projects, showing the influence of Modernism and new materials on post-war apartment design, include Aloha Terrace (1947) and Queen Vista (1949) and two large complexes, Shorewood Apartments on Mercer Island and Laurelon Terrace near Laurelhurst.[93]

Harlan Thomas (1870-1953) had American roots but is particularly known for his European-influenced designs. He grew up in Iowa and Colorado, and opened an architectural practice in Denver in 1895, after receiving a degree in mathematics and mechanics from Colorado State College. He then spent nearly three years traveling and

[92] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture* pp. 156-158.
[93] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture* p. 352.

studying throughout the world, before moving to Seattle in 1906. He immediately embarked on two major projects, the Chelsea Family Hotel (1907) and the Sorrento Hotel (1908) on First Hill. Both designs show the influence of his European travels. He later partnered with Thomas Grainger, producing such well known works as the Queen Anne, Columbia and Douglass-Truth libraries (1912-15), the Corner Market Building at Pike Place Market (1911-12), the 7th Church of Christ, Scientist (1923-25), Harborview Hospital (1929-31) and several fraternity and sorority houses. His son, Donald Thomas, later joined the partnership. Thomas taught architecture at the University of Washington from 1926 until 1940 and retired from practice in 1949.[94]

Victor Voorhees was one of Seattle's most prolific architects, working here from 1904 until at least 1957. He is credited with designing more than 100 local buildings, ranging from cottages and large residences to apartment and office buildings, auto dealerships, industrial buildings, fraternal halls and commercial structures such as Washington Hall and the Vance Building. His apartment/hotel work includes the renovation of an engineering school into the Vance Apartments (now the Marqueen Hotel, 1926), the Adams Apartments (1915), the Washington Arms (1919), the Vance Hotel (now the Hotel Max, 1926) and the Earl Hotel (now the Seattle Hotel, 1928). However, he has become best known for a popular book of house plans, *Western Home Builder*, first published in 1907.[95]

---

[94] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture*, p. 126-131.
[95] Ochsner, *Shaping Seattle Architecture*, p. 353.

William P. White practiced architecture in Seattle from 1902 until 1922, specializing in apartment and hotel buildings. He designed a major early apartment complex, the Manhattan Flats (1905). Other examples of his work include the Kinnear Apartments (1908), the Calhoun Hotel (1909), the Imperial Apartments (now the Paramount Apartments, c. 1910), the Olympian (1913) and the Sagamore (now the Queen View, 1917). Several of his works have been demolished, including the Astoria Family Hotel (1909), the Knickerbocker Apartments, and the Jefferson Apartments. He also designed the well-known Sylvia Hotel (originally the Sylvia Court Apartments, 1912) in Vancouver, B.C., which was designated a heritage building in 1975.

William Whiteley (1892-1974) is best known for his courtyard apartments in variations of the Mediterranean Revival style. Several of these were designed for developer Frederick Anhalt, including La Quinta (1927) on Capitol Hill and Seville Court, Barcelona Court (1927) and Franca Villa (1930) on Queen Anne. Montrose Court (1927) and Rosina Court (1928) show Tudor influences, while Briar Crest (1928), Olympus Manor, the Martha Lee (1930), the Catalina (1930), and the buildings at 411 E. Republican, and 26 and 432 Bellevue E. (1928) are more typical apartment blocks. He also worked with Frederick Anhalt on his early market buildings in neighborhood commercial districts, including the Cora M. Graham Store Building (1926) on Beacon Hill and a bungalow court (1926-27) in West Seattle. Most of these buildings were designed for Jerome Hardcastle or for his partnership with Anhalt, the Western Building and Leasing Company.[96] In 1935, after apartment development had virtually halted due

[96] Building records, Seattle Department of Planning & Development.

to the Depression, Whiteley joined with Anhalt in forming the Architectural Services Inc., which designed and built homes and sold sets of house plans throughout the country.[97]

APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT BY NEIGHBORHOOD

Intensive apartment development is focused in several neighborhoods close to downtown, each of which has its own distinct character. Apartment buildings are also found in other neighborhoods, focused along arterials (generally former streetcar routes) and close to business districts.

Pioneer Square

In the period of reconstruction after the fire of 1889, Pioneer Square saw the construction of both elegant hotels and numerous workers' hotels. Notable hotels included the Hotel Seattle, the Butler, Hotel Seward (now the Morrison Hotel) and the later Frye Hotel (1906-11). Today, the Frye and the Morrison remain, renovated for low-income housing. Many of the district's smaller buildings housed single workers in modest hotels of 2-to-4 stories with small residential units above retail uses on the ground floor. The residents, overwhelmingly male, stayed for weeks or months at a time, and included lumber camp workers, merchant seamen and other laborers. They shared baths on each floor and ate at the restaurants and taverns that proliferated nearby.

---

[97] Lawrence Kreisman, *Apartments by Anhalt*, Seattle: City of Seattle Office of Urban Conservation, 1978.

International District

The area known today as the Chinatown-International Historic District, located just east of Pioneer Square, is particularly rich in early hotels and apartment buildings. Historically, it was populated primarily with single men who arrived from China, Japan and the Philippines to work in the United States. Legal restrictions prevented them from owning land, living in other parts of the city and, often, from bringing women over so that they could establish families. These facts led to a dense development of workers' hotels and a large number of ethnic restaurants, bathhouses and other services to serve the residents. Because of the immediate proximity to the train stations, larger buildings were also constructed to serve travelers. Most of these buildings remain today, except for those that were razed for construction of the I-5 freeway in the 1960s. Many have now been renovated (or are proposed for renovation) into low-income housing with larger units.

Downtown

Downtown Seattle between Pioneer Square and Belltown (roughly Cherry Street to Virginia Street) developed historically as a retail and business center with relatively little housing. Some apartments developed along the eastern edge, where downtown merged with First Hill. Most of these buildings were demolished for construction of the I-5 freeway or for large projects such as the Washington State Convention and Trade Center. Around the turn of the 20th century, family hotels such as the Lincoln and the Rainier Grand developed, but these are no longer extant. During the 1920s hotels catering primarily to the upper- and middle classes proliferated throughout downtown.

Although they focused primarily on travelers, they also had permanent residents. Some special purpose buildings also included hotels or apartments, notably the Moore Theater and Hotel, the Paramount Theater, the Fisher Studio Building and the Eagles building. Workers' hotels were also built along First Avenue, convenient to the waterfront and the Pike Place Market.

Belltown/Denny Regrade/Queen Anne

The vicinity of First Avenue and Bell Street, north of downtown, developed concurrently with Pioneer Square, and its centerpiece, the Austin Bell Building, was constructed as apartments in 1889. However, Denny Hill blocked the city's northward progress and it was not until the hill was regraded, between 1898 and 1911, that it opened up for development. It quickly became a concentrated residential area, with two distinct types of buildings. Workers' hotels, typically without individual bath and cooking facilities, lined First Avenue. By 1906, larger buildings were constructed north of Denny Way to Queen Anne, primarily with efficiency apartments for sales clerks, clerical staff and other downtown workers. Following the 1911 regrade, this type of development spread throughout Belltown, east to Fifth Avenue. Because of its good streetcar service and outstanding city views, many apartments (including luxury buildings) were built on Queen Anne hill from 1906 through the 1920s, and it is today the site of some of the city's best multifamily examples.

In 1917 the area of the first Denny Regrade, roughly between Second and Fifth avenues and from Stewart Street north to Cedar Street, was promoted as "the city's coming

apartment zone." Approximately thirty apartment buildings were built in this area before 1930, and most of them remain today. These red brick-clad buildings are a major part of the neighborhood streetscape. The numerous turn-of-the –century examples of worker's hotels on First Avenue such as the Guiry (1903) and the Schillestad (1907) are also important, although more of them have been demolished. Their survival is primarily due to their having been purchased and rehabilitated by social service agencies to provide low income housing.

Eastlake/Cascade

The Cascade and Eastlake neighborhoods lie northeast of downtown Seattle, near Lake Union between the Denny Regrade and the University District. Its natural connections to Capitol Hill, just to the east, were cut off by the construction of the I-5 freeway in the early 1960s. Lake Union was one of the city's earliest industrial areas, and Cascade was a community of worker housing, including small apartment buildings. A number of these survive today, including Carolina Court and the Jensen Block. The streetcar line began running along Eastlake Avenue in 1893, opening the area to the north up for residential development. Its convenient access to downtown and the University District led to a proliferation of apartment buildings. Eastlake is particularly noted for the density of bungalow courts along Eastlake Avenue and for the number of smaller buildings that fit into the urban fabric on the side streets much like large single-family homes.

First Hill

First Hill, just east of downtown, was the city's first intensively developed apartment district. When residential development moved east following the fire of 1889, this became a neighborhood of fine homes. By the early 20th century, however, institutions such as churches, hospitals and schools developed here, seeking larger lots than were available downtown. Apartments appeared in the same period, including the St. Paul (1901) and the San Marco (1905). By 1915, First Hill was probably the city's densest neighborhood, with numerous apartment buildings. This increased during the late 1920s, which saw the development of the high-rise buildings in the Boren Avenue vicinity. This trend intensified in the 1960s-70s and in recent decades.

Capitol Hill

Capitol Hill, adjacent to First Hill on the northeast, developed into a dense apartment district in the first decade of the 20th century, largely because of its excellent streetcar connections to downtown. It remains the city's primary apartment neighborhood, with apartments of all descriptions, from modest buildings with efficiency units to numerous luxury accommodations. Early development was encouraged by the construction of Broadway High School in 1902. Within ten years, a commercial district with several apartment buildings was constructed, and apartment development continued to spread. The district west of Broadway, from Madison to the Roy streets, was largely apartments by the early 1920s. Scattered apartments were also built in residential areas, before zoning prohibited this. In the 1920s, dense apartment construction spread east to 15th Avenue East and beyond. The area called Second Hill, or Renton Hill, at the top of

Madison Street, also saw significant apartment construction in the pre-World War period, because of its proximity to the cable car line and its outstanding views.

The University District

Not surprisingly, one of the first neighborhoods with dense apartment construction was that surrounding the University of Washington. The area was still rural when the university relocated here from downtown Seattle in 1895. From the beginning, group and multifamily living was a way of life for both students and faculty. However, actual development of apartment buildings was relatively slow until the 1920s, when at least 20 apartment buildings were constructed. The Collegiate Gothic style, used in campus buildings of the era, was favored, to reinforce the identity of the district and its connection to the university. Some of the buildings reach 7- to 8-stories, the largest built during this period in outlying neighborhoods. The larger ones have amenities such as elegant lobbies and ballrooms. The remaining buildings are 3- to 4 story walkup apartments typical of other neighborhoods, along with a small number of distinctive courtyard buildings, some in Tudor or Mediterranean Revival styles.

Other Neighborhoods

Nearly every Seattle neighborhood saw some apartment development during the late teens and 1920s. Most buildings were located in or adjacent to the neighborhood commercial districts and along arterial streets, close to streetcar lines. They were primarily of two types: two- to three-story walk-up apartments or two- to four-story buildings with stores on the first floor and apartments above. Some bungalow courts, or