



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 538/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, September 3, 2008 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Stephen Lee

Jerry Finrow

Henry Matthews

Tom Veith

Czarina Nicolas

Marie Strong

Mollie Tremaine

Mark Hannum

Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Sarah Sodt

Melinda Bloom

Karen Gordon

Rebecca Frestedt

Absent

Henry Matthews

Ron Martinson

Alyce Conti

Vernon Abelsen

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:40 PM.

090308.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of July 16, 2008

Approval of minutes deferred to next meeting.

090308.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

090308.21 Retroactive Kids/Columbia City Cuts

4859 Rainier Ave. S.

(Columbia City Landmark District)

Proposed storefront signage

Mr. Hannum recused himself as he is the property owner.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Rebecca Frestedt read the staff report. She said the application is for two business identification signs: 1) a new aluminum coated Dibond sign proposed for the east façade above the canopy, and 2) a new two-sided Dibond blade sign that will replace the existing sign. She distributed photographs, drawings and material samples to the board. She stated that the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application on August 15, 2008 and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Retroactive Kids business owner Trisha Gilmore explained that the sign was being updated to reflect the name change of Columbia City Cuts, a partner business co-located within the retail space.

Board Questions:

Mr. Lee stated that the application was straightforward.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith stated that the signage seemed to meet the standards and mimic a sign process and typology that is already in place.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed 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.

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.

b. Blade Signs. Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

e. Upper Floor Signs. Signs conforming to the requirements of subsection (a) above shall be allowed on windows of upper floors as applicable.

Secretary of the Interior 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.

MM/SC/JF/MT 6:0:1 Motion approved. Mr. Hannum recused himself.

090308.22

Lions Club Building – Rainier Valley Historical Society

3710 S. Ferdinand St.

(Columbia City Landmark District)

Proposed window treatments and security film

Mr. Hannum recused himself as he is on the Board of the Rainier Valley Historical Society.

Ms. Frestedt read the staff report and provided background information on the application. She explained that the application was for the application of UV window film and window treatments and distributed application materials to the Board. She said that the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application on August 15, 2008 and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Buzz Anderson, Rainier Valley Historical Society, had nothing to add to Ms. Frestedt's comments.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the photos provided included the proposed work.

Ms. Frestedt stated the photos are of existing conditions and added that the film had not yet been applied. She said the applicant is proposing to add pull down window shades to the interior of the windows facing the west side.

Ms. Sodt reported that the Rainier Valley Historical Society has an archive and want the protective shading for that.

Ms. Frestedt added that the shades are only proposed for the windows on the alley façade.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith thought it was a light touch that seems to preserve transparency.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed alterations. 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

Guidelines/Specific

5. Transparency. To provide street-level interest that enhances the pedestrian environment, street level uses shall have highly visible linkages with the street. Windows at street-level shall permit visibility into the business, and visibility shall not be significantly obscured by security bars or gates, frosting, etching, painting, extensive signage, window darkening film or mirrored film, window treatments, or other means. The intent is to encourage pedestrians to focus on the products or services offered, rather than the signage.

MM/SC/TV/CN 6:0:1 Motion approved. Mr. Hannum recused himself as he is a member of the Rainier Valley Historical Society Board.

090308.23

Coca Cola Bottling Plant

1313 East Columbia Street

Proposed window replacement and other exterior alterations

Ms. Chave explained the application and said that ARC saw the applicant's proposal for window replacement and other alterations including skylight replacement, replacement of boiler flue and lighting fixtures. She said the applicants presented a window condition survey as well as a number of alternatives they considered. She said that the ARC did not come to consensus about which, if any, window replacement they preferred though they thought the applicants had done their homework and could present their preferred proposal for Board consideration.

Applicant Comment:

Sari Graven, Director of Facilities at Seattle University, explained the university's desire to repurpose the building into a sustainable, energy efficient and comfortable office environment while respecting the building. She introduced Rick Sundberg of Olsen, Sundberg Architects.

Mr. Sundberg explained the building started as an industrial/bottling plant in 1936 and their goal is to repurpose it first as a temporary library for Seattle University and then ultimately it will become offices for the Seattle University Facilities Group. He said they like the building and feel it adds to Seattle University's campus. Seattle University has a mandate that buildings are sustainable from energy use standpoint and this building is sustainable in terms of keeping the building. He said they did a window study (available in file) to determine the best option for window replacement and think their choice will be a close match. He said the windows will be painted to match the wall system. He explained they want to replace the existing non-operable skylights with operable skylights to allow the building to be naturally ventilated when feasible. He said the boiler flue and adjacent shed will be removed. He said

the existing entry doors are wood framed with plywood painted blue; they propose to put in aluminum of the same style, not painted blue, but reuse the exterior hardware. He said they propose to restore and keep the east side door. There were two light fixtures at the entry; one is missing. It is too expensive to recreate so they have proposed an alternate fixture. He said they will replace the parapet and drop the lip down about 1” to get a decent waterproofing seal.

Board Questions:

Mr. Lee asked why the entry door is being replaced.

Mr. Sundberg said the existing doors are in bad shape and the aluminum door will be much sturdier. He thinks they are the original doors and they want to reuse the hardware which he believes is original as well. He said the profile on the new doors will match existing although there is a little ogee stop on the existing doors which won't be matched. In response to Board question he showed on the presentation boards the existing and the proposed windows.

Mr. Lee noted it looked like there is more framing to the new windows; the muntin is more visible now. It was pointed out that the upper muntins on the original windows are thinner than and not as visible as on the new windows.

Ms. Chave recommended deferring the decision to ARC to approve and be specific about changes the Board wants made and that it could be approved at ARC.

In response to a question from the Board about the large windows on the lower level that show on the early photos of the building Mr. Sundberg stated they intended to match the profiles as close as possible. The windows would be painted to match the exterior wall color. The flue is proposed to be removed because it is unsound and it isn't required anymore. The metal parapet cap slopes at 45° angle and the flashing comes down to the vertical piece; they want to drop it another inch and keep it tight to the building. They will be replacing the tent shape skylights with flat skylights to be part of the ventilation system.

Ms. Graven provided a letter from community member Bill Zosal who supports their application and a letter from Seattle University Facility Advisory Committee in support of the application.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Many Board members expressed concern that the window replacement profile doesn't match the original and the fenestration design is changed quite a bit by the large muntin. It was determined the applicant should bring specific information to the ARC to address these concerns.

Mr. Sundberg stated they would go back to the manufacturer to look for a smaller muntin and return to ARC with their findings.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed window replacement with the condition that the applicant will propose methods for reducing the visual impact of the mid-awning muntins in both the upper and lower level windows and defer final approval of this element of the application to ARC. The Board approves the replacement of skylights, removal of boiler flue and service shed, replacement of north entry doors, replacement of two entry light fixtures with the condition that the existing fixture be stored for possible later reuse, and removal and replacement of sheet metal parapet cap, as per the applicant's submittal. This action is based on the following:

1. The Board considered the applicability of 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 applicant has provided a complete window survey and analysis on the existing windows and skylights proposed for replacement, and has researched alternatives to the proposed replacement. The applicant has demonstrated the need and appropriateness for the proposed replacement. The design of the replacement windows is compatible with the landmark building.

The other items included in the applicant's proposal also meet this Standard

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

MM/SC/TV/JF 6:1:0 Motion approved. Mr. Hannum opposed.

090308.3 DESIGNATION

090308.31 Fischer Studio Building
1519 Third Avenue

Kate Krafft, Architectural Historian, presented the nomination (full report in file) for the City and provided context of the site and general area. Ms. Krafft explained the three part design façade: the store front level, the shaft, and the cap which is the top two floors which is the performance space and do not include window on the façade. She stated the Fischer Studio Building appears to meet at least three of the designation standards: C, D and E.

With regard to standard C, the building's role in providing housing for musicians, vocalists and later dancers and artist is significant. The building was constructed in 1912 and expanded in 1914-15 to its current design. It was part of the era when the initial commercial district was absorbed by commercial development. The building was constructed by George Fisher who became a real estate developer after accumulating great wealth during the Klondike Gold Rush. Bebb and Mendel designed the original building; it was originally designed as an office building but Kohler and Chase Piano store occupied the storefront and the office space became studios for musicians. Most of the upper floors were studio apartments for musicians which included both living and teaching space. The top two floors were a concert

hall and lounge. The building became established and known as the Fischer Studio Building. In 1974 Ralph Anderson acquired the building and converted it to condominiums in an era when Pike Place Market was being preserved; Mr. Anderson was active in the earliest preservation activities in Pioneer Square.

With regard to standard D, the building is described as Venetian inspired which may be based on the blind tracery treatment of the terracotta at the cap and the grotesques that are part of the crested parapet.

Ms. Krafft thought the building was also an outstanding example of a builder or designer. Although the initial construction was designed by Bebb and Mendel its significance lies with the work of Bebb and Gould in 1914-15. Theirs was a successful partnership responsible for the Hoge Building, the Fry Hotel, Puget Sound News Building, Terminal Sales Building Annex, the Times Square Building and the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Building. Gould was highly regarded for his work on elaborate residential designs and the University of Washington campus buildings and his role in establishing the University of Washington School of Architecture.

Ms. Krafft noted there are some integrity issues: the storefront level has been altered, the west elevation has been altered but the entire terracotta façade is intact and the utilitarian side elevations are unaltered. Originally there were elaborate display windows meant to display pianos but these have been altered.

Ms. Krafft stated the building is significant in its association with cultural activities in downtown Seattle; it is one of the very few apartment buildings built in this area during this era; and, it is important for its architectural design and association with Bebb and Gould.

Board Questions:

Ms. Sodt introduced owner/representatives Yancy Wright, Tim Tomlinson, and Megan Kruse.

Mr. Wright stated they are pursuing designation on just the façade because changes have been made on the elevations. They have a permit to remodel the entry which will move the front door out to the sidewalk.

Ms. Kruse said there has been a lot of work over the years on the retail space.

Ms. Sodt explained the applicant had a permit for this work prior to the landmark process. She stated the Staff Report recommends designating the entire exterior; she said that the concerns of the ownership regarding the secondary elevations can likely be addressed at Controls and Incentives.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Sodt explained that when the building was nominated, the entire exterior was nominated which is standard. Ms. Sodt said that she is confident that during the Controls and Incentives negotiation phase Board staff can work with the owners to

come up with an agreement that addresses the concerns of the owners. This is a Category 1 building in the Downtown Survey.

Mr. Finrow said yes on C, D, and E; it is nice work of Bebb and Gould.

Mr. Hannum agreed and said the building was great and significant.

Ms. Nicolas said yes to C, D and E.

Ms. Tremaine said yes to C and was not sure about E.

Ms. Strong said yes to C, D and E.

Mr. Veith had reservations about E but said yes to C, D and E. As for the features to be recommended for control he thought the entire exterior of the building should be designated; the Board has worked with many owners and he didn't think having the entire exterior designated would prevent a future board from considering changes to the side elevations. With regard to changes to the storefront he suggested a system that can be modified to accommodate the different businesses that might inhabit those spaces.

Mr. Lee said yes to C, D and E and agreed with Mr. Veith's comments.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Fischer Studio Building at 1519 Third Avenue a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/MH/MS 7:0:0 Motion approved.

Mr. Wright expressed concern that the entire exterior was designated. The Board and Staff assured him his concerns could be dealt with at the Controls and Incentives portion of the process.

090308.4 NOMINATION

090308.41 Laurelon Terrace
4644 41st Street NE

Amy Kosterlitz, Gordon Derr, introduced Ruth Benfield and Mary Hodgson who would provide context for the nomination.

Ruth Benfield, Vice President of Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center (CHRMC), briefly explained the hospital plans expansion on to this site. She said Laurelon Terrace owners approached CHRMC about selling their property to the hospital and the CHRMC agreed it would be good for expansion.

Mary Hodgson, Laurelon Terrace Homeowners Association stated the possible sale is a valuable opportunity for them. She said there are many maintenance issues facing the owners and there is nothing noteworthy about its history or aesthetics. She asked

the Board not to nominate; the homeowners are pleased with the opportunity for CHRMC to expand and the financial opportunity for the homeowners.

Susan Boyle and Sonja Furesz, BOLA Architects presented the nomination report (full report available in file).

Ms. Furesz noted the twenty building garden complex was designed in 1949 by B. Dudley Stuart and Robert Durham. Following WWII large master planned sites were constructed of modest design and construction. Builder Edgar Johnson obtained a street vacation before starting construction. The area included a mix of middle class and professional residences. The buildings were modest simplified Colonial Revival style with low sloped gable or hipped roofs, unpainted brick on the first story and cedar on the upper story. Most of the buildings were slightly different from one another in design; there were five types of wood panel entry door and there was a contrast between the stained and painted cedar siding on the various designs. The buildings retain their original massing and configuration. The shingle roofs have been replaced with composition shingles, the original cedar siding has been replaced with composite and the windows have been replaced.

Ms. Boyle provided a profile of architect Robert Durham and distributed information about his career (available in file). Durham was a prolific architect known for his civic activities and was very active within the architectural community both locally and nationally. She said Laurelton Terrace meets the common characteristics of a garden court complex but there is nothing distinctive about it. Garden courts exist all over the city and is a very common building type.

Ms. Furesz and Ms. Boyle stated Laurelton Terrace explained why they do not believe that Laurelton Terrace meets any of the criteria required for designation.

Ms. Kosterlitz summarized the BOLA report and said that she agreed with BOLA's findings.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked about the density of Laurelton Terrace compared to the comparables.

Ms. Boyle explained Laurelton Terrace is comprised of 136 dwellings or 40 per acre and is not much different from others. In response to Board questions she stated the 2nd story siding has been changed, all has been painted but much of the original cladding is intact. She doesn't think the building rises to level of significance.

Public Comment:

Jeffrey Ochsner said that he submitted a letter to the Board that explained why he did not believe the property met the landmarks criteria; he asked the Board not to nominate as it does not meet the criteria.

Muriel Donaldson, former resident, spoke against the nomination.

Kris Nelson, Laurelton resident, asked the Board not to nominate.

