



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 176/09

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, March 18, 2009 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen

Marie Strong

Tom Veith

Mollie Tremaine

Meredith Wirsching

Christine Howard

Stephen Lee, Chair

Sean Peterfreund

Alyce Conti

Steve Savage

Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Rebecca Frestedt

Genna Nashem

Melinda Bloom

Absent:

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

031809.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meetings of February 4

MM/SC/TV/MS

7:0:2 Minutes approved as amended. Ms. Howard and Ms. Tremaine abstained.

February 18, 2008

MM/SC/CH/MT

8:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Wirsching abstained.

031809.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

031809.21 4860 Rainier Ave. S.

(Columbia City Landmark District)

Proposed business identification signage.

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Rebecca Frestedt explained the request for business identification signage. Two signs are proposed: 1) Vinyl decal adhesive lettering and logo applied to the interior of the storefront window and, 2) vinyl lettering adhered to the face of the canopy. See attached photographs and material samples. The signage had been applied without a Certificate of Approval. On February 27, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for business identification signage.

Mr. Abelsen stated the application meets the Guidelines.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said the proposal is reasonable since the applicant did not modify the canopy and was able to fit the lettering within the spacing of the face of the canopy.

Mr. Lee agreed it seemed reasonable.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

Relevant guidelines

11. Signs. All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications will be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape, texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color, and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

a. Window Signs and Hanging Signs. Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.

Ms. Conti arrived at 4:43 p.m.

031809.22

3811 and 3815 S. Ferdinand Ave.
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Proposed exterior alterations, including construction of a retaining wall, installation of pigeon netting, re-roofing, gutter and hand rail replacement.

Ms. Frestedt explained the application and summarized the proposed exterior alterations. She said the Columbia City Review Committee and members of the Architectural Review Committee received a briefing on January 16, 2009. The applicant revised portions of the application in response to Committee recommendations. Committee members requested alternatives to the steel hand rail and retaining wall options. The Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee reviewed the revised proposal for exterior alterations on February 27, 2009 and did not reach a consensus for a recommendation. Ms. Frestedt introduced one of the property owners, Tom Reid.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Reid presented via Power Point and explained that 3811 S. Ferdinand St. is a fourplex and 3815 S. Ferdinand St. is a single family residence. The 2nd floor vestibule door on the 3811 building was not original and would be removed so it would look similar to the vestibule door on the first floor. He showed photos of the existing roof, gutters and railing on the 3815 house and the proposed roofing material. He provided a ventilation plan which illustrated how they planned to ventilate the roof. He said they planned to install ridge vents and soffit vents wherever possible and use another product where they are not able to use the soffit vent (Smart Vent). Baffles will be used at the eaves. He explained that approximately 50' of gutters are missing, 44' are patched and leaking and 47' are rotted at the corners; existing gutters are not salvageable. He said that he will replace the cedar fascia in kind where needed.

Board Questions:

Regarding the retaining wall, Mr. Lee stated that the owner must get approval from SDOT for the proposed retaining wall because the existing stairs go into the right of way and coordination with the City will be required.

Mr. Reid replied that he had an appointment set up with SDOT. He went on to explain that the some of the existing gutters are cedar (and are in very poor shape) but they plan to put up aluminum which would be painted to match the house. He went over a drawing he provided which showed roofing details. The also went over the proposed handrailing which could be painted any color to tie in with the house or to disappear. He stated that they decided not to submit alternative materials for the railing. He said the goal was to make the rail disappear instead of making it a prominent feature. He explained the proposed stacked concrete retaining wall and provided a photo.

In response to a clarifying question Mr. Reid said the only place that has cathedral ceilings is in the entry and there is no insulation in that part of the building. He said they will open it up when they strip the roof and put vent baffle all the way up in that area.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen explained that Mr. Reid demonstrated he had thought through the gutter replacement. Although he was a proponent of a different type of handrail than what was proposed, Mr. Abelsen said that since it could be removed he wasn't totally opposed to it. He wasn't sure about the stacking walls but appreciated retaining and breathing new life into the buildings.

A couple Board members expressed concern about the stacked concrete retaining wall aesthetic. Mr. Savage asked if there were examples of simple rock retaining walls in the District. Mr. Reid said he wasn't sure. There was general agreement from the Board that this portion of the application would be deferred pending additional information.

In response to a Board member's question about the use of metal railing, Mr. Lee explained the technique is used a lot and painted black; they have been installed on many landmarked buildings because they are so neutral.

Mr. Abelsen started to propose a motion, but recalled the motion due to questions about procedural coordination with the Department of Transportation regarding the retaining wall and public right of way. Ms. Frestedt recommended that the Board defer the decision on the retaining wall until additional information is provided by the applicant.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Board approve the proposed exterior alterations at 3811 and 3815 S. Ferdinand Avenue, excluding a decision on the proposed retaining wall which will be deferred upon submission of additional information about alternative material options.

This action is based on the following:

Relevant Code citations

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

Relevant guidelines/General

8. Emphasis should be given to maintaining the character of, and enhancing compatibility with, contributing buildings.

Relevant Design Guidelines/Specific

2. **Building Materials and Fixtures.** Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials in keeping with the historic character of the District.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

MM/SC/VA/CH

10:0:0 Motion carried.

031809.23

Lake City Library
12501 25th Ave NE
Proposed re-roofing

Ms. Chave explained ARC reviewed the application and had concerns about the metal replacement roof.

The applicant, Morgan Elliott with Miller Hayashi Architects stated they had looked at cedar shingles as an option but selected the metal because it would be more durable. He said the metal product would maintain the horizontal lines of the exterior contrasted the low slung arches and the masonry wall. He said the mansard roof is characterized by horizontal lines in the cedar shingling and coping. He provided a sample of the roofing material. He said they selected metal because sheet metal is used on the existing library and they didn’t want to introduce a new material to the building.

Brian Miller with Miller Hayashi Architects stated the brick wall and curving corners were listed as the primary features in the nomination report and the roof was mentioned and not prominent. He went on to say that if the building had been built today it is likely metal roofing would have been used. He said the client was driven by maintenance and durability issues.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wirsching said the roof is a very prominent feature on the building from 125th. She said because the metal siding on the building is a newer element it doesn’t make sense to try to relate it as an historic element.

Ms. Chave explained the whole exterior of the building is designated. Because it is a mansard roof with shingles it has more interest. She said if cost is an issue and is used as justification for the change to metal more information would be needed.

Mr. Miller said the issue was maintenance and that cedar shingles are not sustainable.

Public Comment:

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, said the building pops out because of the uniqueness of the shingles and she wouldn't want the wood shingles to be changed to metal shingles.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said he understood the applicant's concern about maintenance and durability but if the roof were well maintained, it wouldn't be a problem. He was in favor of keeping cedar as the shingle material.

Mr. Lee said he was fine with considering different materials but was concerned with the reflective quality of the metal and suggested looking for alternatives that would look more similar to what is there now.

Mr. Veith stated that the only argument that made sense was about maintenance. He pointed out it was not appropriate to pick a material to go with the character of the new addition, and one is not to speculate what might have happened had something been available at the time of construction. He said the roof is noticeable as one drives down 125th and is a prominent feature; he thought that cedar shingles was an intentional choice by the (original) architect. He was not supportive about the proposed metal option and would prefer that it more closely resemble the existing material. He stressed that one must be guided by what the Board decided when it made the decision to designate the building.

Ms. Howard expressed concern about the color and reflectivity.

Ms. Strong agreed with Mr. Veith and cited the Secretary of Interior's Standards that state when a new feature must be installed due to deterioration it must match old in design, texture and other visual qualities. She thought the proposed metal roof did not meet that standard.

Ms. Tremaine said the roof is so prominent that she recommends sticking with the original material.

Mr. Lee said the consensus was the Board would vote against the proposed material. If the applicant chose to replace the roof with the same material it would be an in-kind replacement and they wouldn't have to come back. If another material is selected, the applicant has the option of coming back.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board **deny** the application for the proposed re-roofing with metal shingles, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not meet the following Standard of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*:

Standard # 6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities

and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical or pictorial evidence.

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

MM/SC/MS/CH

10:0:0 Motion carried.

031809.24

Terminal Sales Annex

1931 Second Avenue

Proposed skybridge removal and infill.

Ms. Wirsching recused herself from this application.

Miriam Hinden explained the proposal to remove the skybridges and went through a packet of materials provided to the Board. She said the skybridges are not original to the building (they were added in the 1940s) and are not in use; they have been blocked off at the annex side. She stated the owner of the Terminal Sales Building is still going through the review process so they are proposing one side (the Annex side) first.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Abelsen said the proposal was reasonable and he would support it.

Mr. Veith agreed the proposal was acceptable.

Ms. Strong indicated the address on the drawings was incorrect and should be changed to 1931.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed sky bridge removal and proposed infill, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report as the proposed exterior alterations are on a secondary elevation and do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/TV/VA

9:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Wirsching recused herself.

031809.3

DESIGNATIONS

031809.31

Lake City School

2611 NE 125th Street

Mimi Sheridan summarized the nomination report (full report in file) and focused her presentation on changes to the building. She said the school was an important part of Lake City history. The School District was formed in 1912 when it was a rural area and this school was the second one built in 1931 and at the time it was the major building in the area. Even now it is one of the most distinctive buildings in the area. It was consolidated into the Shoreline School District in 1944 and became part of the Seattle School District in 1954. It was closed in 1981. It was designed by Stimson and McDonald in 1931; later additions were design by William Mallis in 1945 and Wyatt Stapper in 1986.

Ms. Sheridan explained the building shows the visible characteristics of Georgian Style with the split pediment, urn, fluted pilasters, and very large 8/8 windows. She went over a plan showing the original building and later additions. She said the original building consisted of a small section and a large gymnasium to the rear and was added onto by the WPA in 1939 with a one-story addition on the west end which included finishing up the two-story section. She said the original building ends were made to finish later. In a 1945 the one story addition to the east was constructed in the same style with large windows but with a smaller entry. She went over a 1955 photo which showed the main building, one story addition and the original gym, the garage/carport area, portables with no foundation and small house that had been move from another site. Later, grand entries were added to the gym on two sides and a mezzanine was added. The portables on the south wing originally had no windows; in 1986 they were rebuilt and windows added. She noted that the main front entry is original; changes to other entries and landscaping were likely made in 1986.

Mr. Veith noted the changes were that the original three leaf door had been reduced to two leaves; the overall opening was the same but the pattern of the doors themselves appeared to be modified.

Ms. Sheridan said that had likely occurred in the 1986 construction where they had replaced in-kind as much as possible. She said that while some siding might be original much had been changed out.

Tingyu Wang, representing the owner, the Seattle School District, spoke in support of designation.

Public Comment:

Wayne Duncan spoke in support of designation and shared a New York Times article about the need to preserve buildings constructed by the WPA because that aspect of history is important. He said that Mallis's work was noteworthy – he took a simple stately design and enhanced it. He recommended preserving the school in its entirety and said there is only one other landmark in Lake City. He noted the community significance – the school operated as a social center. He noted that two Pulitzer Prize winners – Gary Snyder and David Horsey – are alumni of the school. He reiterated designating the site and all buildings.

Don Martin, Greater Lake City Council, supported designation and said the school is dear to residents of the area. He said it is a significant building in an area where there aren't many – and he wants it to be protected and cared for. He said he wants the entire façade preserved.

Jean Horsey, mother of former student and Pulitzer Prize winner David Horsey , spoke in support of designation. She said the community needs it and asked that no part of it be demolished. She said she had volunteered for the PTA and Jean Godden, Seattle City Councilmember, followed her as President. She asked that the entire building and site be designated.

Kathleen Brooker, Historic Seattle, supported designation and quoted the letter she had sent. She said it meets the threshold and that it has significant character, interest and value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of Seattle. She said the school qualifies under a number of criteria specifically its distinct Colonial Revival stylistic presence. She recommended designating the site in its entirety.

Cathy Wickwire, Washington Trust, supported designation of the building and the entire site. She said Washington Trust had sent a letter of support.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Tremaine supported designation based on the Staff Report – C, D, and F. She said the building was important, beautiful and well kept and recommended designating the brick portion only.

Mr. Veith agreed with the Staff Report and cited the multiple uses and functions of the school. It had associations with two school districts and also federal agencies. It is well woven into the cultural, economic and political heritage of the area and meets Criterion C. In support of Criterion D he said it is not a perfect example of Georgian Revival but it does have a lot of character elements of that style. He said the brick bond pattern helped through its expansion tie in seamlessly on the west structure. He noted there had been a variety of minor changes and that the gym had been modified. He said the building is prominent in its location on a major street and in contrast in style and age with surrounding buildings so meets the threshold of Criterion F. He said it is apparent the whole portion between the annex and the gym is new so recommended not including that in the designation. He supported inclusion of the site.

Mr. Abelsen agreed with the Staff Report on Criteria C, D and F. He said the school is significant to Lake City culture and economy. He said the continuity of additions is nicely done and he noted the linear aspect of the façade as significant.

Ms. Strong supported designation based on C, D and F.

Mr. Peterfreund supported designation based on D, and especially C and F. He said the school is clearly an anchor in the neighborhood.

Ms. Conti agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation on C, D and F.

Ms. Howard agreed with the Staff Report and recommended including the site.

Ms. Wirsching agreed with the Staff Report and said the façade on the original and later additions are seamless. She was not in favor of including the south portion or the gym.

Mr. Savage supported designation based on C, D and F and was not in favor of including the south portion.

Mr. Lee supported designation based on C, D and F and said it is a landmark in the community.

Mr. Veith clarified that the gym – although greatly altered – is part of the original building and should be included.

Mr. Lee added clarifying language to exclude the wood framed part of the south annex.

Mr. Abelsen stated the gym is not an annex.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Lake City School at 2611 NE 125th Street a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the nomination; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the site and the exterior of the building, excluding the wood frame South Annex wing.

MM/SC/VA/CH

10:00 Motion carried.

Mr. Lee left at 5:30 p.m. Vice Chair Abelsen took over chairing the meeting.

031809.32

Naval Reserve Armory
860 Terry Avenue North

Leonard Garfield, Director of MOHAI, said MOHAI was thrilled the Naval Reserve Armory would be their future home and that they were committed to the history of the building and adaptive reuse of the historic features.

Sonia Sokol Furesz, BOLA, summarized the nomination report (full report on file) and began with an overview of the career of Architect B. Marcus Priteca who, along with William Grant, designed this building. Priteca was a prominent architect with a 50 year career who also designed the Pantages Theater and the Admiral Theater in the same year as the Armory. She provided 1947 and current photos which show few exterior alterations. The heavy massing is indicative of the Moderne Style.

Board Questions:

In response to clarifying questions Ms. Sokol Furesz explained the base in the entry is terrazzo. She said that although included in the legal description the site boundaries excluded lot 13.

Ms. Chave added that the boundary goes up to the sidewalk on the Terry side.

Kathleen Conner, Parks Dept, explained that the Parks Dept owns the building and property. She said the Parks Dept. supported designation and are working with MOHAI on the new use of the building.

Public Comment:

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, supported designation and said it is great for the entire community.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Howard supported designation based on the Staff Report, C, D and F. She said the history is fascinating given its previous use and how it is constructed.

Ms. Conti supported designation based on the Staff Report, C, D and F and said it is a tremendous building.

Mr. Peterfreund supported designation based on C, D. and F and recommended adding the gunnery.

Ms. Strong supported designation based on the Staff Report, C, D and F.

Mr. Veith supported designation based on the Staff Report C, D and F. He said it meets C because of the development of Seattle's development as an important port – the military involvement in that. He said the fact that this naval facility was located on the lake was the culmination of a lot of threads of local history. He said that D is less clear but the decorative motifs connect it to the Navy and it shares characteristics of armories throughout the country. He said it embodies the distinctive characteristics of that approach to building and incorporates Moderne elements through its design and strengthens its connection with the naval character of the building. With regard to Criterion F he said it is an obvious feature of the entire lake community and has an aura that influences a lot of nearby development. He didn't object to designating the gunnery although the space has been changed. He suggested adding the wet training room – it was a late addition in the 1980s and might not even qualify under the 25 year limit. He cited the nautical characteristics of the building: the ship style hatches on the interior and exterior and the deck hatch that connects with the Ward Room. He said the bridge space despite the exterior expression has lost all its equipment on the interior so one almost needs an explanation as to what it was so gave the wet training space more prominence in his opinion.

Ms. Tremaine agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation based on C, D and F. It is a prominent building and that it will be occupied by MOHAI is very exciting.

Mr. Abelsen supported designation based on the criteria noted in the Staff Report and asked Staff about including the gunnery and the wet training room.

Ms. Chave advised the Board to not break apart every element and that staff would address those spaces in the Controls and Incentives but the Board could include those features in the designation if the Board thought they should be designated.

Discussion ensued about whether or not the gunnery and wet training room should be included in designation and while some Board members thought they should be included, it was determined that the building should be left as flexible as possible.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Naval Reserve Armory at 860 Terry Avenue North a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building; interior spaces including the west lobby with adjacent landing and stairwell, the north lobby, the drill hall, the Ward Room (second floor), and the bridge (at the fourth level on the north end); and the site (excluding lot 13 of the legally described site).

MM/SC/MS/CH

7:0:0 Motion carried. Mr. Savage and Ms. Wirsching recused themselves.

031809.3 NOMINATIONS

031809.31 Zeek's Pizza/Rodeo Café
423 Denny Way

Mimi Sheridan presented the nomination report (full report in file) and began by providing context of the site which is located at the cusp of the Denny Regrade at the nexus of a new development area – Fisher Studio, Seattle Center – and the 1920s development area. She wasn't sure of the exact date of construction but a 1911 photo of Tillicum Park shows the building in the background. The Rodeo Café was a long term ground floor tenant and apartments were on the upper floors.

Ms. Sheridan pointed out the stucco clad walls, hanging bays, a bracketed cornice with a frieze below and transom windows. The balconies were original but have been rebuilt. Sandstone at the foundation may be part of the original foundation (a new foundation was put in about 40 years ago); the façade has been restored with bulkheads. The pilasters were corbelled at the top. She said the most striking element is the Italianate cornice. In 1965 a new foundation was put in and a major renovation was done in 1978 and the apartments were converted to offices. The façade was renovated and the center entry altered in 1997.

Ms. Sheridan noted the unusual style of the building with its bays and its prominent location and how it contrasts with its surroundings. She said it is a good example of Italianate style which is rare in Seattle. She said bays were discouraged after the fire in the late 1880s.

Board Questions:

In response to Board questions Ms. Sheridan explained that this was a Category 1 building which is notable for its prominent cornice, solid base with lighter top. The strongest Italianate element is the bracketed cornice and the bays are more typical of Queen Anne style. She couldn't speak to integrity but said a lot had been replaced

in-kind and the tile in the entry is newer; some cladding is newer but the brick is original.

One of the owners, Doug McClure stated he didn't like the process and that it didn't work for a small building like theirs and that there were consequences for small businesses when a City board makes a decision. He said the owners would have to hire professionals to represent them. They run a pizza business and purchased the building for an investment.

Karen Weill, one of the owners of the building, said it is a beautiful building and they have taken good care of it. She said they bought the building as an investment twelve years ago. She doesn't know a lot about designation but doesn't like the process and thinks designation would negatively impact them financially if they ever want to sell it.

Tom Weill, one of the owners said it is a handsome building in a good location. He said they take care of the building and while there should be some preservation of buildings others are more difficult – like their building. He didn't know the long term economic impact but thought there would be a negative economic impact. He said the process is bad for them. He said it seems like they would have to hire experts to go through this process. He said there is a lot of talk about the buildings but not about the people who own them.

Mr. Abelsen noted the Board is a volunteer group and is part of the process, not the whole process, and if the property owners had questions they should speak with staff that could help if this moves forward with a nomination.

Mr. McClure said Board staff has been helpful and has done a good job of explaining how it works but the process is geared toward bigger projects.

Mr. Abelsen explained that the designation standards address the significance of the property itself.

Mr. Veith wondered if the owners had an opportunity to look at the criteria used for judging a building.

Mr. McClure said they had and said they had strong feelings. They read the nomination and the criteria and they aren't educated about this and able to articulate their feelings – if they get to that point they have to hire people to represent their thoughts so they don't get run over.

Ms. Tremaine asked if he knew about Special Tax Valuation and other financial programs available.

Mr. McClure said it wasn't applicable because the incentives are too low to apply to their building; it is fine for a larger project but if they spend \$200,000 it doesn't add up to enough to encourage them to go one way or another. On a bigger building it would make a difference.

Ms. Conti asked if they owned the pizza parlor or the entire building.

They replied they own the building but they also own the pizza business.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Savage said the criteria didn't fit well with this building and while it had some nice features it was not distinctive or exemplary.

Ms. Wirsching agreed and said there were too many unknowns and it was not particularly unique.

Ms. Howard said it was a lovely building with a distinctive cornice but it doesn't rise to the level of landmark status.

Ms. Conti noted the nice details but that the building doesn't meet the threshold.

Mr. Peterfreund stated that while handsome the building was not landmark-worthy.

Ms. Strong said it is compelling at its location and how it graces the Chief Sealth statue but on its own she would not support nomination.

Mr. Veith stated it is a borderline building and that it is part of an ensemble of public space and that the building is a good background building rather than a landmark. It has survived in a neighborhood where many have not and embodies the character of that period. It meets the threshold criteria – age, integrity – but it doesn't meet significance. If owners were not planning to tear it down and replace it he's not sure they'd be suffering any risks by its being landmarked. He said the building isn't significant enough to be landmarked.

Ms. Tremaine said it is not unique and while it is prominent there is nothing special enough to go through the designation process.

Mr. Veith said he thought about Criterion F but it worked better as part of an ensemble.

Mr. Abelsen agreed and said it had some nice features but it was more a contributing building to a small microcosm of buildings around the square and would not support nomination.

Action: I move to not nominate the Zeek's Pizza/Rodeo Café Building at 423 Denny Way for consideration as a Seattle Landmark based on the consensus that it does not meet any of the designation standards.

MM/SC/SS/MW

9:0:0 Motion carried.

031809.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

031809.41 Coca Cola Bottling Plant
1313 E. Columbia

Ms. Chave presented the request for extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Coca Cola Bottling Plant for thirty days.

MM/SC/TV/CH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

031809.5 BOARD BUSINESS

031809.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator