1. INTRODUCTION

Background

The University of Washington is proposing to reroof portions of Hutchinson Hall, which was built in 1927 as the Women’s Physical Education Building. The building is located in the north area of campus, which dates from its establishment in the late 19th century. The proposed project will involve repairs or replacement of deteriorated, original and non-original roofing, which consists of slate and composition shingles, as well as membrane materials at built-in gutters and flat roof areas. The original roof also has copper flashing, ridge cresting, eave gutters and downspouts.

Consistent with its historic preservation policies, as outlined in its “University of Washington Master Plan—Seattle Campus” of January 2003 (2003 Seattle Campus Master Plan), the University of Washington sought historic and urban design information about Hutchinson Hall in a Historic Resources Addendum (HRA). This type of report is developed for any project that makes exterior alterations to a building over 50 years old, or is adjacent to a building or a significant campus feature older than 50 years. Hutchinson Hall is subject to this requirement because of its age. An HRA is required also for public spaces identified in Fig. III-2 of the 2003 Seattle Campus Master Plan.

This report provides historical and architectural information about the building, a preliminary evaluation of its historic significance to the University, information about the proposed project, and recommendations. A bibliography and list of source documents is provided at the end of the text, followed by original drawings, building plans, and historic and contemporary photographs.

The HRA study was undertaken by BOLA Principal Susan Boyle, AIA, Preservation Planner Sonja Molchany and Intern Architect Abby Inpanbutr. Assistance to the preservation planning team was provided by Dan Cornwall of CC & L Roofing of Portland, and by the following University personnel:

- Jeannie Natta, Project Development Manager, Capital Projects Office
- Lyndsey M. Cameron, Principal Architectural Associate, Office of Planning and Budgeting
- Thomas Berg, Facilities Project Architect, Facilities Services/Campus Engineering
- Ashley A. Kangas, Interim Unit Manager, Capital Projects Office
- Ellen Oxley, Lead Roofer, Physical Plant

Research Methods

The project began with a meeting and tour of the building, undertaken by Susan Boyle and University personnel on April 11, 2011. The tour included access to an upper deck at the top of the tower, from which roof areas could be viewed, and to interior spaces to observe water damage.

Research was undertaken to provide historical context and factual data about the development of the building and surrounding campus context, and the building’s roof design. Sources included historic maps and drawings from the University Libraries Special Collections Division, and drawings, specifications and reports from the University Facilities Services records along with photos and a hazardous material survey provided by the University’s project manager. Other research included reviews of archival newspaper...
collections from the Seattle Public Library, and digital photography collections of the Museum of History and Industry (MOHAI). During on-site tours BOLA’s planning team noted and photo-documented the building’s historic character-defining features and its existing conditions. The team also reviewed historic and recent design drawings, specifications and reports and records to understand the building’s current performance. A draft report was submitted on May 8, 2012, and recommendations were discussed at a meeting with University personnel on May 11, 2012. The final report was completed after these reviews.

Project Goals

This HRA report focuses on the roof of Hutchinson Hall and specifically on the portion to be reroofed over the former main gym area. The report responds to the following issues and project goals raised by University representatives at a meeting on April 11, 2011:

- The existing roof slate, which dates from the building’s original construction, is very thin and brittle, and it often breaks while roofers try to patch and repair the roof. Older composition shingles over the main gym roof is in poor condition.
- The building is experiencing on-going leaks and interior damage from water infiltration is evident. While leaks have occurred throughout it, the majority are around the perimeter.
- In places over the original main gym area, it is possible to see through the roof to the floor.
- The building was to be restored in 2013, but funds are not available. An interim solution is sought for a “temporary” 10-15 year roof to stop leaks until the restoration is funded.
- Recommendations are sought for the temporary roofing, and for future restoration of the roof, the copper ridge caps, gutters and downspouts, and suggestions for fall protection.

Executive Summary

The roof over the original main gym is in poor condition, as evidenced by water damage to the interior which has resulted in paint spalls and deterioration of wood decking and finishes in the rooms below. This HRA documents the building’s construction, which originally included provision of graduated Vermont slates as the roofing material. It cites original large skylights over the main gym and pool wing, and their subsequent removal and infill of roof openings with decking and composition shingles.

The HRA recommends restoration as the preferred approach to preserving Hutchinson Hall. It notes that the future project should include on-site cleaning of existing slates as part of a preliminary investigation to verify if repairs or in-kind replacement of roofing slates are required. Synthetic slate was considered as a potential future replacement material. Because of its relatively high cost and concerns about curling, synthetic slate is not recommended unless weight is a cited issue in a future seismic analysis. Long term recommendations call for use of in-kind material -- Vermont slate -- along with retention, salvage and reuse or in-kind replacement of copper ridge caps, eave gutters, scuppers, and downspouts. Establishment of a cyclical roof cleaning program is recommended, as are procedures for contractor selection and material specifications, and provision of tie-off devices for fall protection.

A short term recommendation calls for temporary roofing over the former main gym area, consistent with the goal of undertaking the work as soon as possible. Rolled membrane and metal standing seam roofing products were considered for this work, but composition shingles are suggested. One option is for composition shingles similar to or matching those on the roof of the swimming pool wing, which were installed in 2011. As an alternate, a less costly composition shingle with a shorter life span should be considered, as it would work for a 10-15 year period in anticipation of a future restoration project.

2. HISTORIC PRESERVATION FRAMEWORK
The University Stewardship and Historic Preservation Policies

As noted in the 2003 Seattle Campus Master Plan, the Regents provide stewardship and planning for its historic properties as part of its project planning. Preservation efforts begin with identification of the property (a building, object, structure or open space) and preparation Historic Resources Addendum (HRA). According to the Master Plan, the intent of the HRA is to “provide a context to insure that important elements of the campus, its historical character and value, environmental conditions and landscape context are preserved, enhanced, and valued. [It] further insures that improvements, changes and modifications to the physical environment are analyzed and documented.”

Based on historic campus planning documents, the 2003 Seattle Campus Master Plan identified potential development areas on the campus, along with specific significant buildings, which are associated with the early development of the campus and early campus master plans. These plans include the 1898 Oval Plan, the 1909 Alaska Yukon Pacific Exposition Plan, and the 1915 Regents Plan. Significant campus elements that were part of the early master plans of 1898, 1909 and 1915, and “unique and significant landscapes” on the campus are identified also in the Master Plan in Figures III-2 and III-5.

Neither of these citations included the subject building, although Denny Field, located directly behind Hutchinson Hall, is identified in Figure III-5. Hutchinson Hall is not identified as being within a potential development area, although new construction on Denny Field is suggested, as either an addition to it or as a free-standing building, in the Campus Master Plan on Figure IV-63 (below).
3. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Development of the University of Washington's Campus

The University of Washington was established by the State Legislature in 1861 as the first public university in the state. Initially it was sited on a ten-acre parcel in what is present downtown Seattle. By the late 1880s, the original facilities were inadequate due to increasing student enrollment and urban development. The University Land and Building Commissioners hired local architect William E. Boone to develop a comprehensive plan in 1891 for a new campus at its current Seattle site. The University moved to this location in 1895. Denny Hall, the University’s original classroom and administration building, and the nearby Observatory were completed that same year.

The Regents sought to develop a campus plan to guide future building locations, and in 1898, engineering professor A.H. Fuller developed such a plan, known as the Oval Plan, which included only the northern portion of the University site. Other buildings constructed in the 1890s, in addition to Denny Hall and the Observatory, include the two dormitories, later named Lewis and Clark Halls.

All four of these building remain in the north campus area, and Lewis Hall is located directly southeast of Hutchinson Hall. Denny, Lewis, Clark, and Hutchinson Halls are among 15 buildings on the campus that were included in 2004 in a “Building Restoration, Renewal and Prioritization Study,” which resulted in the University’s “Restore the Core” program. Since that date Clark Hall has been renewed through an upgrade and rehabilitation, and restoration of Denny Hall has been initiated.

The Oval Plan, known also as the Fuller Plan, ca.1898. (University of Washington, from Johnston, p. 20.)
In 1903 the Board of Regents hired renowned landscape architects, the Olmsted Brothers, to prepare a design for a general campus plan. While the resulting 1904 Olmsted plan was never realized, it was adapted in part as the plan for the Alaska Yukon Pacific Exposition (AYPE). In planning for this exposition local businessmen approached the University Regents in 1906 to suggest that the undeveloped southern portion of the campus be used for the fair grounds. The plan was then developed by the Olmsted Brothers, who also provided the landscape design. As a result, the lower campus was cleared of timber. Thus a good portion of the present campus plan descends from John Charles Olmsted’s Beaux-Arts design for the 1909 fair grounds.

The AYPE grounds reverted to the University in 1909, providing the central axis of Rainier Vista, an encircling road system, along with an emphasis on the landscape and formal layout of buildings. The AYPE also left the University with a number of so-called permanent buildings. After the AYPE, most of the University’s buildings were built in the Central and South campus areas.

The Regents Plan of 1915 reaffirmed the Olmsted design for the AYPE grounds while adapting its symmetry and formality in a plan for the upper campus. The plan served as the basis for two subsequent decades of design and construction.

Henry Suzzallo, the University of Washington’s fifteenth president who served from 1915 to 1926, envisioned the institution as “the university of a thousand years,” with the library as its heart. Bebb and Gould’s 1915 Regents Plan, adopted during Suzzallo’s first year as president, placed the library and administrative buildings on intersecting axes, with the Liberal Arts Quadrangle to the northeast and science facilities to the southeast along Rainier Vista and the southern portion of Stevens Way. Major athletic facilities were to be located along the eastern edge of the campus near Lake Washington. Utilitarian structures, such as the Power Plant, were positioned east of Stevens Way, between the primary campus and the athletic facilities.

The 1915 Regents plan was consistent with other Beaux-Arts and City Beautiful designs for American civic centers, towns and campuses during the period between the 1880s and 1930s, as exemplified by plans of Chicago and St. Louis, and Columbia University and the University of California Berkeley. Beaux-Arts design principles included axial alignments, balance and symmetry, and a hierarchical order reinforced by the use of landscape.

In 1934, the Regents requested a reexamination and update of Bebb and Gould’s 1915 plan. The resulting 1935 Campus Plan essentially reaffirmed the earlier one, while recommending some changes, such as the location of a student union building to east of the library, the siting of a health sciences complex south of Northeast Pacific Street, and location of student housing in the northeasterly part of campus.
In 1925, Bebb & Gould proposed a revision to their earlier Regents Plan of 1915, to include a formal boulevard that extended west from the University to serve as a principal entry to the campus from the city. Campus Parkway, the formal axis envisioned, was constructed finally in the 1940s. It extended the University campus into its surrounding neighborhood in a monumental manner. Construction in the 1970s, of an underground parking garage below the Central Quadrangle, provided a primary vehicle entry south of Denny Hall. This reduced vehicular traffic along the campus ring road, which includes Stevens Way in the north campus area, along which Hutchinson Hall is located.

Immediately following World War II, major changes were made in response to the influx of students attending on the GI Bill, establishment of the University Medical School, and delayed infrastructure needs on and around the campus. The University’s basic plan was again updated, resulting in the 1948 Campus Plan. In addition to supporting the 1935 campus design, the new plan recommended increased density, and acquisition of new property in the Northlake / Portage Bay area south of the main campus.

In the 1950s, a University Architectural Commission was established and a University Architect appointed. Collegiate Gothic was replaced by Modern style architecture as the preferred style for new campus buildings. Buildings on the campus constructed in the decades after World War II were designed to emphasized new materials and expressive structural qualities. Prominent among these was the Student Union or HUB (1949, currently undergoing a large expansion), and the Faculty Center (1958-60), which are located on the east side of campus on either side of Stevens Way. Designs for university buildings became more diverse in the 1970s, with newer Brutalist and Modernist style structures, and the ongoing additions and rehabilitation and adaptive use of older buildings.

Despite changes, the plan of the original University of Washington campus remained essentially intact. Principles of the plan have been used in recent master plans, guiding contemporary construction on the
campus and some of the other campus extensions to the south and west. Newer facilities have introduced contemporary architectural forms, materials and styles, and urban design linkages. The result is the present campus, strongly reflecting its early layout, and made up by buildings of different eras, styles, forms and materials that together represent its development over time.

The Original Architect, Carl F. Gould of Bebb & Gould

The firm of Bebb & Gould served as the University architect for several decades in the early 20th century. Born to a wealthy New York family in 1873, Carl Frelinghuysen Gould (1873–1939) graduated from Harvard University in 1898 before traveling to Paris to spend five years at the famed Ecole des Beaux-Arts. At the Ecole, Gould followed in the footsteps of other young aspiring American architects in the latter half of the 19th century—H. H. Richardson, Charles McKim, Bernard Maybeck, Louis Sullivan, and Julia Morgan. Upon returning to the U.S. he worked for five years in the New York offices of McKim, Mead and White and G. B. Post, and the Chicago firm of D. H. Burnham and Company. For Burnham, he traveled to San Francisco in 1905, and in 1906 he formed a brief partnership with Beaux-Arts-trained Walter Blair and J. E. R. Carpenter.

Gould arrived in Seattle in 1908, a year before the AYPE, at the age of 34. The growing provincial city had a population of nearly 240,000 people, due to incorporations and a population boom in the preceding decade. It was in an expansion moment in history when the state sponsored the AYPE on the grounds of the University campus in 1909. Gould immediately entered Seattle’s cultural and professional life, working briefly worked as a draftsman at Everett & Baker Architects, and subsequently Daniel Huntington. The two formed a relatively short-lived partnership, Huntington and Gould, in 1909-11. Gould also worked on his own from 1907 until 1915, when he and Bebb established their partnership. Gould’s early practice resulted in large residences in Seattle, the Highlands, and on Bainbridge Island.

Gould’s partner, Charles Herbert Bebb (1856–1942), came to Seattle in the early 1890s as the architect on a project by the Chicago firm, Adler and Sullivan. Bebb’s early Seattle practice included a partnership with Louis L. Mendel, 1901-14, prior to the more lasting one he established with Carl Gould. Bebb & Gould’s first notable works were the cast concrete buildings at the U.S. Government’s Chittenden Locks (1914-16), the Highlands residence for William Boeing, and the Seattle Times Building (1913-15, presently the Times Square Building). The firm’s initial work varied with Gould continuing to design large residences while Bebb brought in commercial work through connections to bankers and businessmen.

Carl Gould taught a class in residential design for the University’s Home Economics Department in 1913-14. In 1914 he founded the University of Washington’s Department of Architecture, where he served as the Department head and instructor, from 1914 to 1926, while also acting as the unofficial University architect. Gould also served as the president of the Seattle Fine Arts Society (1912-16 and 1926-28) and president of the AIA Washington State Chapter for two terms in the 1920s. He was active in the local Chamber of Commerce and was appointed to the City first Planning Commission. In 1928 he also organized the Poche Club, a successor to the Seattle Architectural Club.

During the decade that followed the 1915 Regents Plan, Gould had the full support of the University’s dynamic new president. The two men shared a vision of the university campus and a goal of improving its buildings. Henry Suzzallo commissioned the first new building to be constructed under the Regents Plan, the Gothic Revival Raitt Hall (1915). The following 25 years would see over two dozen additional buildings on the campus designed by Carl Gould, typically Collegiate Gothic style structures. These included the Men’s Physical Education Pavilion/Hec Edmundson Pavilion, (1926-27) and the UW’s Henry Art Gallery (1926) in addition to the Women’s Gymnasium/Hutchinson hall (1927).
Gould’s 13-year tenure as the University’s unofficial architect came to an end soon after the election of Governor Roland Hartley in 1924. Over claims of budget problems, Hartley replaced many of the University’s regents in 1926, and the new Regents in turn dismissed President Suzzallo. Hartley criticized the arrangement under which Bebb & Gould had served as the University’s architect while Gould chaired the Department of Architecture. Gould resigned from the Department in October 1926, after which the Regents dismissed Bebb & Gould from their professional position with the University. Most of the buildings on the campus after this time were designed primarily by non-faculty members. Physics Hall, the first building on the Science Quad, was the first academic building by the newly-appointed campus architect, John Graham. Bebb & Gould remained involved, however, as the supervising architect for the University’s Penthouse Theater in 1938-40.

Carl F. Gould designed campus plans and educational buildings at the Washington State Normal School (1924, WWU, Bellingham), Lakeside School (1930, Seattle), and St. Nicholas School/Cornish Institute (1925, Seattle). His commercial projects included Seattle’s Fischer Studio Building (1913-15), Puget Sound News Company (1915), and Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Building (1922-26), and Everett’s Weyerhaeuser Company Building in Everett (1923). Gould’s later work embodies his interest in the Moderne style, notably with the Seattle Art Museum/Seattle Asian Art Museum (1931-33) and Everett Public Library (1933-34). Perhaps his greatest contribution to northwest architecture remains his work as the founder of the University of Washington’s Architecture Department, and the plans and buildings for the campus. The Bebb & Gould partnership continued until Gould’s death in 1939.

The Building History and Use

Hutchinson Hall was built as the Women’s Physical Education Building in 1927 for an overall construction cost of $312,000. When constructed, it replaced an older Gymnasium that dated from 1896. A new Men’s Physical Education Building was constructed the following year. The site for Hutchinson Hall identified in historic records as Denny Field.

Nearby Lewis Hall was built as one of two men’s dormitories in 1899 to the east of the future site of Hutchinson Hall. After World War I it was renovated for exclusively use by women students. Lewis Hall presently contains offices and conference rooms for a variety of university programs.

In 1947 the Women’s Physical Education Building was renamed “Mary Gross Hutchinson Hall” in honor of a former head of the University’s Women’s Physical Education Department. The original building contained a large and small gymnasium, swimming pool, and classroom, office and storage spaces. (It also was reportedly the location of an early Works Progress Administration (WPA) mural installed during the Depression. The mural’s presence has not been verified although there is a bas-relief sculpture in the main lobby.)
Above, a view of Hutchinson hall in 1931, prior to the realignment of Stevens Way in ca. 1938 (UW Libraries Special Collections, No. CFT0125).

For many years the building’s large gymnasium space was used regularly for dance performances and social dances. “Dance Dramas” were frequently presented by the University’s Department of Physical Education for Women. In 1950 the Seattle Times announced that additional gymnasium space would be added to Hutchinson Hall for women’s physical education, but apparently this project was not realized as the building remains its original size. By 1963, space on campus for physical education was inadequate for the student population, and construction of a new Intramural Center was announced.

The new athletic center was situated near Husky Stadium, and greatly expanded sports facilities on the University campus, but Hutchinson Hall continued to be used for physical education and recreation. The swimming pool and dressing area were renovated in 1967, and in 1971 interior alterations resulted in additional classroom, lab and research spaces in the basement level. For several years the Department of Kinesiology (the science of human movement) was located in Hutchinson Hall. This program was ended in 1982 due to lack of funding.
The 1954 photo of Hutchinson Hall above shows the roadbed of Stevens Way, which was widened in 1938. It currently appears wider. The sidewalk was widened after 1954. (UW Libraries Special Collections, No. 1983z).

Hutchinson Hall served as an athletic center for women students through 1984. By that date, however, the role of physical education in the curriculum had diminished. The building was remodeled for the Drama Department according to a permit set of drawings dated May 20, 1988 and subsequent record drawings of April 1, 1989, both by Carlson Ferrin Architects. The two large gym spaces allowed for easy adaptation and occupancy by drama programs. Drawings indicate that the main gym was converted to studio and rehearsal spaces. The small gym was converted later to a black-box theater and rehearsal space in 2010. Original locker room spaces in the building’s east end became the School of Drama design studios, and the swimming pool was filled and remodeled in as part of the 2010 alterations.

According to records from the University Facilities Services and the Drama School web site, Hutchinson Hall is an estimated 52,470-square-foot building, which presently contains thirteen faculty offices, four classrooms ranging in size from 15 to 40 workstations, and a 1,700-square-foot Drama Library. As part of
the building renovations in for the School of Drama, multiple theater and support spaces were created 1988 - 1991, including a costume shop with over 7,000 square feet of storage, and the Drama School’s design studios.

Historic Overview of the Drama School

The School of Drama was founded in 1919 as the Department of Dramatic Art as part of the English Department, and was located within Parrington Hall. In 1922, the Department was admitted into the College of Fine Arts and moved into Denny Hall, and in 1926 it began offering Bachelor’s degrees in Drama. In 1940 the Drama Department separated completely from the Department of English, and the School of Drama was established, offering Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees. The School operated an influential children’s drama program from the 1940s until 1982, with puppetry classes taught by master puppeteer Aurora Valentinetti. The School’s Creative Dynamics and Child Drama program became nationally recognized.

Professor, playwright and director Glenn Hughes was a major influence in the development of the Drama Department. Hughes (1894–1964), originally from Nebraska, was a recent graduate of Stanford University when he arrived at the University of Washington in 1919 to work in the Department of Dramatic Art as a teaching fellow. In 1927 he won a Guggenheim Fellowship and left the University to pursue personal studies. Hughes returned in 1930, at which time he was appointed Executive Director of the Department of Drama as part of the College of Liberal Arts.

Hughes is credited with developing the School of Drama into a nationally recognized theatre program. He led the School of Drama until 1961 and during his tenure wrote over 60 plays, in addition to other literary works and his service as the school’s director. Hughes developed the program after the mode of professional acting conservatories. Under his leadership the Drama Department became a central part of Seattle’s cultural life, with black tie opening nights and frequently sold-out shows.

The Drama Department’s performances were held initially in Meany Hall, which was designed for assemblies and concerts as part of the 1909 AYPE. (The original Meany Hall was replaced by the present Meany Hall for the Performing Arts in 1974.) This venue was too large for plays, but it was the only available performance space for the Department in its early years. Under Hughes’ direction, new performance spaces were established including the Studio (in a leased building leased on University Way Northeast, presently the Floyd and Dolores Jones the Playhouse Theater), and the penthouse suite at the top of the nearby Meany Hotel (Hotel Deca).

In the 1930s Hughes began experimenting with theatre-in-the-round, holding regular performances in the intimate Penthouse Suite. The popularity of these shows by the “Penthouse Players” led to the construction of the Penthouse Theater in 1940-41. This building, built with WPA funds in an Art Deco Moderne style, was reportedly the first Modern-era theatre-in-the-round constructed in the United States. The University also operated another unique performance venue around this time, the Showboat Theater, a faux riverboat located on Portage Bay (in use from1938-1984, demolished). The University eventually purchased the former Studio/Seattle Repertory Playhouse in 1950. The theater was renovated recently.

In 1984 the School of Drama began its move into Hutchinson Hall, an action completed after the 1988 renovation was completed. In 1991-92 the Glen Hughes Penthouse Theater was moved to a new, nearby location on the north end of the campus, and renovated with a full-size basement. The School of Drama currently holds performances in this theater, the Floyd and Dolores Jones Playhouse, and the Meany Studio Theater.
ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

Contemporary aerial view of Hutchinson Hall, outlined in red, and its surroundings. (Google Maps, May 2012.)

Campus Setting and Site Features

Hutchinson Hall is located in the North Campus, on the east (northeast) side of East Stevens Way Northeast. The physical context for the building was changed considerably from its original setting due to nearby roadbed realignments that were undertaken in 1938. Stevens Way was expanded, leaving little open space along the sidewalk on the west side of the building for landscaping. Because of this change, the recessed northwest-facing entry court of Hutchinson Hall has taken on more prominence as an open space. This court, located at the northwest corner of the building, faces out toward Stevens Way and the Foster School of Business and Foster Business Library Buildings across the street.

To the north and east of Hutchinson Hall are Denny Field and a series of tennis courts. Lewis Hall, which was a women’s dormitory when Hutchinson Hall was constructed, is located east/southeast of the tennis courts and Hutchinson Hall. Klickitat Lane intersects Stevens Way just west of Hutchinson, to serve as a link between the main part of campus and buildings near its northern edge, including off-
campus residences. The Penthouse Theatre was moved to a site to the northwest of Hutchinson Hall in the 1990s, and Hansee Hall, a dormitory dating from the mid 1930s, is located to the north. Both of these buildings are screened by trees and plantings along Whitman Lane.

Paved walkways run along the east and west sides of the building, providing access to a number of entrances at the building’s basement and first floor. Landscaping around the building consists of shrubs planted close to the building along the west side, with thinner, more intermittent plantings along the east side (facing Denny Field). Groupings of conifers are planted very close to the building near the middle of the west side and near the south end of the east side.

The Gothic Revival Style

Collegiate Gothic was endorsed by architect Carl Gould as the suitable architectural style for the campus buildings due to its symbolic content and a visual association with older English universities. This style was popular in residential design from the 1840s through the 1870s, but it continued to be applied to high-style public and religious buildings, and particularly to collegiate buildings, due to its historic association with English colleges. The Gothic Revival style offered adaptability to the sometimes irregular plans that individual buildings and their academic functions required. Colored brick in warm shades of brown, pinkish-gray cast stone, cream-colored terra cotta, and variegated color roof slates were adopted as primary exterior materials for University of Washington buildings. Decorative brick patterns and sculpture were used to embellish many of the campus’ Gothic Revival buildings.

Other characteristic features of the Gothic Revival style, which are embodied in Hutchinson Hall, include asymmetrical massing; steeply pitched roofs, usually with steep cross gables; wall surfaces that extend into gables without planar breaks; parapeted gable end walls; arched-head windows set in assembled groups, and one with tracery treatment; and arched-head, multi-panel wood doors. The hexagonal tower of Hutchinson Hall, detailed with battlements at four outer corners, and designed with a single pinnacle, clearly recalls medieval turrets and forms. The building’s romantic character appears to be particularly appropriate to the drama programs within it.

In addition to Hutchinson Hall, Bebb & Gould’s Gothic Revival designs—constructed from 1915 through the 1920s—included Raitt, Savery and Miller Halls, the Main Library (later renamed Suzzallo Library), and the Henry Gallery. Other buildings constructed in the late 1920s and early 1930s utilized the style in a more abstract manner, as exemplified by Physics, Guggenheim and Science Halls, designed by architect John Graham Sr., and Anderson Hall and the Hec Ed Athletic Pavilion, by Bebb & Gould.

The Building

(Note: the large, central part of Hutchinson Hall, which originally held the main gymnasium, and the original swimming pool wing, do not face any of the four cardinal compass points. In the narrative descriptions of the building in this report, the following reference orientation are used when citing walls, elevations and facades: “West” is anything facing Stevens Way; “North” is actually facing northwest; “East” or the back of the main and south wings, includes anything facing Denny Field; “South” is anything facing southeast.)

Hutchinson Hall has an irregular footprint, consisting of a three distinct parts. A large, roughly rectangular main mass is situated parallel to Stevens Way, with a lower scale section on its east side and a hexagonal tower and a wedge-shaped “knuckle” to the northwest. The “knuckle” forms a link to a smaller rectangular portion on the west, which is set at an angle from the main building mass. The wedge-shaped “knuckle” contains the main entrance to the building and faces onto a modest entry plaza. The south end mass—oriented with its gable roof ridge perpendicular to the street—originally housed a swimming pool, and is presently a two-story volume. The main and west parts contain three stories, including a basement,
and main, second and third floors, along with an attic in the top of the tower and a mechanical space in a partial sub-basement.

Hutchinson Hall is a composite structure with different framing systems in each of its sections. As cited by structural engineer Gary Swenson the building has a consistent masonry and cast stone exterior appearance, but three distinct structural systems:

- **The west portion** is a concrete frame structure including exterior walls, floor slabs and concrete columns. The roof is framed with trusses and wood beams for support ... 
- **The central section** (the original large gym space) is a steel frame structure above the gym floor (with its) frame embedded in non-load bearing masonry infill walls. Steel trusses support the wood roof deck. Steel built-up columns occur at the steel roof trusses (20’ o.c.) on the north and south walls ... a fabricated steel beam runs the length of the building on the north and south facades (and) through the cast stone spandrel panels of the large windows and the masonry walls ... A steel I-beam runs under the window sills of the large windows and continues in the walls below the windows. The exterior walls below the gym floor are of masonry clad concrete construction ... The pool addition to the east is an integrally constructed building ... (with) double-wythe hollow wall construction similar to the gym walls. The roof is constructed of wood decking with steel trusses spanning east to west.” (Boyle Wagoner Architects and Swenson Say Faget, June 1996.)

The building’s roof form is varied and complex. It includes a long side-gabled roof over most of the main building mass, with three steep, lower cross gables along its east and west sides; a front-facing gabled roof over the swimming pool at the south end; a front-gabled roof over the north end (north of the “knuckle”); an eight-sided roof over the tower; and a slightly angled side-gabled roof over the “knuckle” portion, with hipped dormers on the east slope of this roof and a very slight hipped projection over the entry. A copper finial tops the tower.

The massing corresponded directly with the interior spaces. According to original architectural drawings, the main gymnasium occupied the 143’ by 92’-8” main portion of the building, with dressing and shower rooms below it at the basement level. The 48’ by 68’ north end contained offices at the first floor and the small gymnasium at the second floor; and the 35’-6”-wide tower and “knuckle” provided a classroom, stair hall, and entrance lobby on the first floor and office and Corrective Gymnasium (in the tower) at the second floor. A Major Study Room occupied the third floor of the tower, with a kitchen and two study rooms tucked behind it to the east. An unfinished attic, situated above the Major Study Room, provided access to adjoining roof areas.

The 58’-5” by 104’-9” swimming pool wing south of the main gymnasium was designed as a secondary component of the building, but apparently constructed at the same time. Set at Ground Level, it also featured a steel truss roof and masonry-clad concrete perimeter walls. The original wing contained a Swimming Pool Room, Dressing and Shower Rooms, Entry Hall and Office, with a Machinery Room in a small basement area. The 28’ by 72’ pool was illuminated originally by ribbed, wire-glass skylights, aligned with it and set along both sides of its gable roof ridge (since removed).

The Record drawings from 1991, by the University Engineering Services, indicate the building contains an estimated total of 52,472 square feet: 26,385 square feet on the first floor, 22,250 square feet on the second floor, 2,672 square feet on the third floor, and 1,165 square feet on the fourth floor (attic). (55,164 gross square feet and 34,050 “assignable square feet” are cited in the 2004 “Restore the Core” Report.)

The exterior of the Collegiate Gothic-style Hutchinson Hall is characterized by its brick masonry finish, consisting of varied shades of brown and tan bricks laid in running bond; pinkish-tan cast stone coping,
trim and details; elaborate fenestration, with multi-light steel sash windows of various sizes and groupings, often in arched openings and with cast stone surrounds; the complex roof forms finished with slate, copper gutters and downspouts, and a copper tower finial; and glazed wood entry doors set into elaborate cast stone surrounds.

The roof above the Main Gym originally contained ribbed, wire glass skylights set along both side of the ridge for its entire length of its ridge. A smaller, similarly-glazed, shed-sloped skylight was situated over a hallway on the north side of the tower. Notes indicate that the lower portions of the roof above the Main Gym were finished with a composition roofing material, while the roofing over the Small Gym was entirely slate.

Notes on original drawings by Bebb and Gould indicate original interior finishes: plastered walls and ceilings, wood base and picture rail in offices, terrazzo floors and marble stalls in toilet rooms, and stairs with cast iron newels and simple wrought iron railings. Interior finishes in the main gymnasium are noted as “common brick walls, struck joints, steel roof trusses, 3” T & G roof exposed, maple floor on cross furred strips, diamond mesh wire guards at all window openings.”

Typical interior doors were stained, flush wood veneer types, with multi-light upper panels and operating transoms in corridor spaces. Room 300, the Major Study Room, originally contained a fireplace within a cast stone surround (since removed), with its chimney terminating in an exterior pinnacle (also removed).

Drawings in the University Facilities Records files indicate the following changes made to the building. (Construction dates, which typically follow the dates of design documents by a year, are not confirmed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926-27</td>
<td>Original drawings (Bebb &amp; Gould)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Swimming pool roof replacement, with “asbestos single roof” materials (Bindon and Wright Architects, Seattle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Swimming pool and dressing area remodeling (Bindon and Wright, Seattle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Roof and lighting remodeling, and skylight removal and partial roofing, main gymnasium (Bindon/Wright &amp; Partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Alterations (Bindon and Wright Architects A.I.A., Seattle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>New women’s and men’s restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Alterations for drama costume shop and classrooms (Carlson Ferrin Architects, P.S., Seattle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Gym remodel (Carlson Ferrin Architects, Seattle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Drama studio improvements (Carlson Ferrin Architects, P.S., Seattle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>ADA door widening at Stair No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Fire and life safety code improvements, including structural/seismic repairs, a new exterior exit stairs, fire sprinklers and alarms, masonry wall and cast stone parapet repairs, and landscape restoration (Boyle Wagoner Architects, and Swenson Say Fager Structural Engineers, Seattle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Drama design studio—decommission existing indoor pool with locker rooms and interior remodel into educational spaces; no exterior work, with exception of roof repairs (NAC Architecture, 2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Roofs and Roofing Materials

As noted, the original roof plan cited varied slate as roofing material over the small gymnasium in the north wing and over the sloped roof sections of the “knuckle” and tower roofs, and slate roof on the middle section of the roof over the main gymnasium area, with composition roofing at the lower edges of the roof. Large skylights were located along the center ridge over the main gym.

A “Revised Layout of Slate Roofing, Sheet No. 320” by Bebb & Gould, dated June 16, 1927, provides a detail schedule for the original slate roofing, which cites the slate as a 3/16” -thick material. The layout drawing indicates that slates from seven different groups were laid in long bands over the roofs of the Large Gym, Small Gym, and Tower. (The drawing notes, “Other roofs are to be as shown on original layout.”) Each group consisted of Vermont slate in different proportions of various colors: “Variegated Green & Purple, Unfading Green, Mottled Grey, and Weathering Sea Green” pieces. Each group also contained different slate sizes: 12”, 14”, 16”, 18” and 20” with corresponding exposures of 5”, 6”, 6.5”, 7”, 8” and 9”. Slates were to be installed with larger sizes and exposures in the lower bands and smaller scale pieces nearer the ridges.

The 1964 project, “Roof Replacement – Hutchinson Hall Swimming Pool,” involved removal of the skylight over the swimming pool and the original slate on the gabled roof, and installation of new “asbestos (composition) single roof on a plywood deck.” The flat roof area on the west side of the wing was finished with built-up roofing on a plywood deck. The subsequent remodel in 1966 included fiberglass batt ceiling insulation over a new plywood ceiling set at the lower chord of the roof trusses, along with other interior revisions.

The 1969 project, “Roof and Lighting Remodeling – Hutchinson Hall Main Gymnasium,” called for removal of “the entire length of existing skylight, and [installation] of matching 3x6 T&G wood decking and flashed asphalt single roofing.” (The Roof Plan, on sheet A1, notes “exist. slate roof” over the west side of the gable roof and “exist. shingle roof” over the east side. Current observations indicate that both sides of the roof gable contain composition shingles along the roof ridge (former skylight area) and slate roofing below on lower sides of the gable. The varied color and size slates remain on other portions of the building roofs, with the original colors having faded to light green, tan, and brownish colors.

These observations appear consistent with a September 30, 1991 Record Drawing of the Roof Plan, by the University’s Engineering Services. This drawing cites built-up roofing on the crickets and the lower roof edge, behind the raised parapet walls; asbestos singles over wood decking on the former skylight areas near the ridge of the main gymnasium; and Vermont slate over wood decking on other areas of the main roof. The schedule notes Vermont slate over the roofs of the tower and “knuckle” and on the north part, along with asbestos composition singles and built-up roofing, installed on the gabled roof of the swimming pool roof. Built-up gravel and modified bitumen roofing is noted on flat roof areas over concrete slabs and wood decks.

With the exception of the roofing on the swimming pool wing, all roof materials are cited on the record drawing and others as dating from 1928. A 1991 drawing indicates that the gutters at the roof level of the main gym were constructed of built-up roofing with gravel over a wood deck. Current gutters at the main gym are built-up, while those at the small gym, “knuckle” and swimming pool wing are conventional eave types made of copper, which are connected to copper downspouts.

A record drawing of 1997 indicated similar roof materials with exception of several flat, concrete roof slab areas that were topped with built-up roofing in 1980 and a small flat roof area treated with built-up modified bitumen roofing. The 1997 drawing cited a material inventory of roofing totaling 30,840 square feet.
Current Conditions

A recent project involved removal of the membrane roofing and shingles on the swimming pool wing and their replacement with a modified bitumen roof with insulation over flat roof areas and asphalt composition roof shingles over sloped areas. Copper flashing was provided at the window sills and along the main gymnasium’s south perimeter wall. The asphalt composition shingles appear to be “Grand Slate” manufactured by CertainTeed or “Timbertex” manufactured by GAF, which are high quality product that cost more than lower grades of composition shingles with shorter life-spans.

Considerable damage is evident on the interior brick walls, painted wood and steel framing materials, and other finishes in the perimeter rooms located in the former main gym space. Interior conditions of the west perimeter wall, below cross-gable roof parapets, and the south wall, which faces the lower swimming pool wing, appear to have been impacted by more water penetration than other areas, making the built-up gutters and side-wall flashing suspect.

Ongoing repair work on the roof of Hutchinson Hall is presently limited. According to the University’s lead roofer, the thin, brittle slates are subject to cracking and often break when roofers access it to make repairs. Some leaks are likely to have come from the thin slates that have been damaged by foot traffic. Roofing crews have noted past leaks in many locations, and there are reports of numerous holes in the slates and in composition roofing. The source of current leaks could be from the deteriorated upper asphalt shingle roofing, which could allow water to drain down the slope to leak at the slate roof level.

Use of scaffolding is appropriate for re-roofing and/or cleaning, and its use may help minimizing walking on the roof surface. However, with a building the size and scale of Hutchinson, scaffolding is costly, and is likely to be used only during a major project. Currently there are no tie-offs or fall protection devices at the roof.

The following description of the roofing is derived from on-site observation from the top of the tower as access at the roof level was not possible. The author also discussed existing conditions with a slate roofing contractor who chose to visit Hutchinson Hall in May 2012.

- The current Vermont roof slates appear to be weathering green and unfading purple slate. The installation is graduated with larger shingles installed at the eave, decreasing in size with the roof slope height to smaller-length shingles exposed at the top.

- Copper in the valleys appears to be good condition, particularly given the building’s age. While records that do not indicate the copper has been replaced its color suggests it may be only 30 to 40 years old. The copper finish at the ridge and valleys is still a light green, whereas worn copper is typically a deep olive green with some streaks. There are few yellow spots that indicate erosion where copper is deteriorated. Typically, the copper sidewalls should be in better shape than the horizontal and sky-facing flashing. The thru-wall, embedded flashing on Hutchinson Hall appears from a distance to be well preserved. (Observations were not made at the roof level.)

- Roofing over the large gym area consists of 3-tab composition shingles on the upper two-thirds of the front (south) roof and on all of the back (north) side. These shingles are very deteriorated, and some are curled. The aggregate is some places is thin and indicates excess wear. In contrast, dormers on the back side of the main gym have newer heavy composition asphalt shingles.

Limited asbestos testing was undertaken by the University’s consultant, URS, and the results provided in a written report dated May 16, 2012.
5. EVALUATION & RECOMMENDATIONS

The Building’s Significance

Hutchinson Hall represents two phases of development on the campus as the University of Washington’s first athletic building for women students, and as an academic building and home to the Drama School. The building has been changed on the interior to meet different programmatic needs, but it has retained its original character and the exterior is largely intact.

Hutchinson Hall is presently 85 years old. The building appears to be a historically and architecturally significant building due to its age, historic presence and service to several university programs, and because of its architectural design and features, which embody characteristics of its era of construction and architectural style. It size and massing, in close proximity to East Stevens Way NE, makes it a highly visible and a prominent feature on the campus.

The building appears to meet the eligibility criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and the Washington Heritage Register. Because of the prominence and shape of the building’s steep gable roofs, and due to its material and craft qualities, the original roofing material is an important feature.

Comments and Recommendations

Background

In 2004 Hutchinson Hall was one of 15 buildings included in a University report, “Building Restoration & Renewal Prioritization Study,” which examined the critical life safety, physical condition, and accessibility compliance of critical structures on campus. The report, which resulted in the “Restore the Core” program, noted concerns with the building’s seismic resistance, energy use, mechanical/electrical/communications infrastructure, and accessibility, citing the lack of an elevator. It noted as major building deficiencies the exterior windows and doors, interior finishes, and building systems, and the high damage potential to the building in a seismic event. The report recommended that Hutchinson Hall be fully renovated and anticipated a schedule for the project in 2013-15. Surge space in Condon Hall was identified.

In the past eight years, nearly half of the 15 critical buildings identified in the “Restore the Core” program have been renovated, including the Drama School’s Playhouse Theater. However, given Washington State’s current economy and lack of funding for capital projects, it is not realistic to expect the complete renovation of Hutchinson Hall in the near future. In lieu of such a project, and in light of critical roofing needs, the University is considering temporary, but major repairs to the roof over the main gymnasium area.

A Preservation Approach

As preservation architects, we at BOLA encourage property owners to undertake comprehensive work, given the integrated performance of a building and its systems, the complexity and increased cost of phased construction, and the logistical impacts on the building’s occupants. In making recommendations for significant historic buildings, we typically adhere to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, and specifically the Guidelines for Preservation and Restoration. For the Hutchinson Hall slate roof we would refer also to specific information cited in the National Park Service Preservation publication, “Technical Brief No. 29 – The Repair, Replacement & Maintenance of Historic Slate Roofs” (Levine, 1992).

Future Material Options
As an alternative to actual slate, simulated slate may be considered as a replacement roofing material for Hutchinson Hall. Often referred to as rubber slate, these products are made of various recycled and/or filler materials. High quality simulated slate products – such as those manufactured by CertainTeed’s Symphony Slate Series, Carlisle’s EcoStar, and Da Vinci’s Belleforte series – have been designed to carefully replicate the appearance of slate in size, color and texture. Local installation of simulated slate products on historic buildings include the bus shelter in Seattle’s Fort Lawton Historic District; historic buildings on Washington State Parks at Fort Worden, Fort Flagler, and Fort Columbia; and the historic Ellensburg Railroad Depot. Several of these projects received approval from the State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.

Simulated slate materials are available in varied sizes. If the material is considered in the future, I recommend a straight-run installation, with different slate widths and colors matching non-fading green and purple Vermont slates.

Benefits of simulated slate roofing include the lower product weight, which may be a factor in a future seismic upgrade of Hutchinson Hall. The product comes in warranted non-fading colors. Simulate slate product are engineered for required snow loads, which may not be an issue in Seattle.

Natural or Synthetic Slate – Wear and Cost Considerations

The University has had experience with simulated slate roofing shingles on Loew Hall, but its roofing crews report the material has curled. As this material does not have proven longevity, its performance requires further study.

Simulated slate manufacturers suggest the potential lead time may be less that with natural slate, and they cite reduced material costs and easier installation with potential savings on installation labor when compared to real slate. One manufacturer has an installed simulated slate roof will cost about two-thirds (66%) of actual slate costs; if a consistent in color and large size product is selected (i.e., 12” x 12”) the cost could be as low as 50% of an actual slate. However, reviews undertaken for this report suggest that the potential saving with simulated slate is limited, particularly in the preferred thickness, sizes and colors, which are more costly product.

One local contractor has estimate the cost simulated slate roofing at $330 to $450/square (one square = 100 square feet) for material alone, vs. the material cost for natural slate of $500 to $800. Installation costs can raise the cost of simulated slate from $1,200 to $1,500/square up to $2,000 to $2,300/square. At the high end, these estimated costs are equivalent to that for a roof using natural Vermont slate.

Washington State Parks has had several historic buildings re-roofed with in-kind natural Vermont slate. A project manger for the agency, Alex McMurray, has cited $2,300/square as the cost for a 2011 project. He also noted that simulated slate was 30% less costly than real slate and that the product was more readily available for small orders, while labor cost was equal.

(Note: General estimates such as these are cited only to indicate a wide range of factors that can impact a roofing project’s costs. Preliminary estimated should not be used for evaluation as they exclude the costs of potential hazardous material abatement, demolition, scaffolding, framing and other repairs; the addition of fall protection components; and general conditions for a General Contractor’s general conditions, overhead and profit, contingencies for change order, along with sales tax, permit and design and inspection fees, and project management costs.)
Long Term Recommendations for Future Roofing

Replacement using in-kind slate materials is preferred, given the significance of the Hutchinson Hall roof as a historic character-providing feature, and the material appearance of natural slate. I recommend natural slate for a future, comprehensive roofing or building restoration project. A section of the existing slate should be cleaned and examined prior to its replacement, as such a test may indicate there are portions of the roof that can be preserved and restored, along with necessary repairs. Retained sound slates and new slates should measure at least 3/8” to ½” in thickness.

A periodic washing of the slate roofing will help its performance. This cyclical activity will remove the build-up of dirt and scum and will minimize biologic growth on the roof. Water should be set at low pressures, with pre-testing to determine the lowest effective pressure of up to 1,200 psi.

A comprehensive restoration project will help preserve a heritage crafts and it will provide the University with a roof life estimated at another 80 to 100 years. I recommend only Vermont slate as their use over time has shown their typical strength and longevity. Slates imported from Asia, which are relatively new to the American market, may not meet the same standards as Vermont slates, and their use is discouraged. The cost impacts of using graduated or varied slates, in the varied colors of Vermont slate as the original roof slates should be analyzed. It is less costly to use slates of consistent sizes and exposures, and slates of uniform size and exposure would allow for ease in making future repairs. The slates should be selected from a narrow range of non-fading colors. All fasteners should be stainless steel, and a thick water shield-like, synthetic underlayment should be specified.

A comprehensive re-roofing project should include salvage and reuse or replication of copper cresting and roof ridges, along with salvage and reinstallation or in-kind replacement of copper gutters, downspouts and scupper boxes, and the copper finial atop the tower. Low-slope areas of the roof and built-in gutter should be treated with contemporary membrane roofing, carefully detailed to obscure its appearance. Ideally the project would include additional seismic upgrading and repairs to the perimeter walls to assure weather tight conditions and eliminate future water infiltration. Interior repairs and repainting could occur as part of the project or as part of a comprehensive seismic and systems upgrade project.

Other Recommendations

- Remove trees growing close to the building walls, such as those along the north and south sides of the main gym.

- Protect the existing roof for inadvertent damage. When accessing the slate roof areas, roofing crews should use a cushion made from 3” thick foam rubber glued onto a small (i.e. 2’x6’) piece of plywood and staked top to bottom, which will help prevent breakage.

- Specified natural slate products in accordance with the recommendations of the National Slate Association, and to meet ASTM C406, Standard Specification for Roofing Slate for an ASTM S1 rating. [ASTM C406 requires three separate tests to determine the physical properties of natural slate and indicate the expected life for the specific material: C121, Water Absorption of Slate; C217, Weather Resistance of Slate; and C120, Flexure Testing of Slate. Based on the tests, results the roofing slate is categorized as S-1 (lasting over 75 years), S-2 (40 to 75 years) or S-3 (20 to 40 years). ASTM C406 also references C119, Standard Terminology Relating to Dimension Stone.]

- Establish a program of cyclical cleaning of the slate roof and masonry.
• Engage an experienced specialty contractor as a consultant to direct future inspection and cleaning of slate roofs. For future inspections or cleaning I recommend CC&L Roofing of Portland.

• Bid future slate roofing work only to pre-qualified roofing contractors. Require evidence of bidders’ demonstrated skills and experience in the installation of slate roofing and copper flashing, and verify the references provided with former project owners and architects. Qualifications for the slate roofing contractor and its on-site superintendent should include experience on three to five similar scale projects for historic buildings. The contractor’s active membership in the National Slate Association is another indicator of its qualifications.

• Consider an on-site review by envelope consultant for future design and construction phases.

Short-Term Temporary Recommendations

Roofing Products

Standing seam metal panel and rolled membrane products were reviewed as options for the temporary roof replacement. They are not appropriate for this project. The standing metal profile would be visually inconsistent with the historic roof profile and the appearance of the building. Rolled roofing membranes do not offer sufficient UV-protection to serve for a 10-15 year period and would not come with a warranty for an exposed installation.

For the interim roof over the main gym a composition shingle product is recommended. If necessary, the built-in gutters should be replaced by removing three lower courses of slate and applying a new membrane or soldered copper. The selected composition shingle product should anticipate the future restoration project. Thus the composition shingles need not be chosen for extended longevity. Comparable cost estimates should be developed for installed roofing using a standard composition roof shingles, or the heavier type of composition shingle used for reroofing the swimming pool wing in 2011. Pricing by the University’s Job Order Contractor should be based on a comprehensive scope, including as appropriate the demolition and removal of roofing, and salvage, dump fees, scaffolding, and hazardous materials abatement.

Permit Requirements

The proposed work is maintenance and replacement in kind. The Seattle Building Code, Section 106.2.12 notes that a building permit is not required for “Replacement of roofing material and siding (but) this shall not include structural changes (or) replacement of sheathing.

Salvage Copper Roof Accessories

Sound copper cresting, ridges, etc. should be salvaged. If not reinstalled these elements should be labeled as to their specific locations, keyed to elevation drawings, and placed in labeled storages boxes for the future. On-site photographs of these elements, prior to removal, may aid in their future installation.

Fall Protection

Devices for fall protection should be installed, such as fasteners with tie-off attachments along the roof ridge line. This report does not provide specific designs or recommendations except to note the devices should have minimal impact on the building’s appearance, be designed in accordance with contemporary safety standards and required reviews, and be tested prior to use.
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