



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 541/10

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, December 1, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen, Chair  
Jerry Finrow  
Mark Hannum  
Christine Howard  
Patrick King  
Steve Savage  
Tom Veith, Vice Chair  
Elaine Wine  
Meredith Wirsching

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Marie Strong  
Betsy Jacobson

Chair Vern Abelsen called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**120110.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
Meeting of November 3, 2010  
Postponed.

*Mr. Finrow arrived at 3:31 p.m.*

**120110.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

120110.21 Columbia Motors Building  
3715 S. Hudson St.  
(Columbia City Landmark District)  
Proposed exterior alterations and paint colors

Mr. Abelsen recused himself. He is employed by the same firm as the applicant, Doug Ito.

Ms. Frestedt went over proposed exterior alterations consisting of application of new paint colors; masonry cleaning and tuck pointing; installation of new light fixtures; replacement of entry doors with wooden full light doors, and, installation of a new garage door on the north façade. Exhibits included photographs, plans and specification sheets. She explained that the Columbia Motors Building is a two-story office building constructed in 1920 and it is a contributing building within the Columbia City Landmark District. She reported that the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee reviewed the proposal and recommended approval for the proposed paint colors, masonry repair and gooseneck lighting fixtures. Committee members were supportive of the proposal to install a new garage door. She said discussion was focused on the design of the grid pattern in the door. Members stated a preference for a simplified design, given the options shown on the cut sheets. Additional alterations originally proposed were discussed at the CCRC meeting, but have since been removed from the proposal.

Doug Ito, SMR Architects, provided context photos of the building (historical and existing). He explained that although Harbor Properties has plans to do more in the future, the current economy limits them to cosmetic upgrades to the building. He went over proposed work including new light fixtures and doors, tuck pointing and painting. He went over the proposed colors: “Olive” on wood windows and primary facades, black on the aluminum windows on the south and west facades and “Thicket” on the concrete walls on south and west facades. He said there would be no change to the existing panels above the windows other than paint colors. The panels and the awning over the entry will be painted black. He went over the locations for the new gooseneck lamps and said that the penetrations would be through the wood panels and not the brick. He said the new full garage doors will allow light in and will be painted “Olive” as an accent. He said that the horizontal conduit will be removed from the back side of the building.

Martha Barkman, Harbor Properties, explained that the back doors will have a consistent look with updated colors.

Mr. Ito explained that Pioneer Masonry will clean the brick and tuck point areas that need it and will then seal with a breathable sealant. He said that on the back they will patch the concrete where needed.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wirsching asked clarifying questions about the method of cleaning.

Mr. Ito explained that the brick will be cleaned with a low pressure wash using Biowash. He said that the sealer proposed is a breathable sealant so the water can evaporate out; the sealer will have a matte finish.

Ms. Wine asked about the color of the eyebrow above the doors and windows.

Mr. Ito said that the large one will be black but the small one over the entrance will be the building color. He said that the gooseneck lights are new and are not replacing existing fixtures. He confirmed that the brick is not painted. He said the areas of concrete have already been painted and they are just updating the colors.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum noted the applicant met all Columbia City Review Committee's concerns. He confirmed that the committee supported the application.

Mr. Finrow noted the nice effort and commented that he liked that the back was being cleaned up. He said the work a big improvement.

Ms. Wirsching said that Pioneer Masonry is experienced in renovation of historic buildings and knows what they are doing.

Mr. Veith said that the low-pressure wash method is approvable.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations and paint colors for the Columbia Motors Building, located at 3715 S. Hudson St. This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior alterations and paint colors meet the following sections of the District ordinance and the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

**Relevant Code citations**

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

**Relevant Columbia City Landmark District Design Guidelines 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 that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

**3. Building Surface Treatments.** Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

- a. Repainted with the original historic color(s) of the building, provided that the business or property owner obtains a professional color analysis; or
- b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in 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.

**#4.** Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

**#9.** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

MM/SC/JF/SS            7:0:1    Motion carried. Mr. Abelsen recused himself.

120110.22

Bethany Presbyterian Church

1818 Queen Anne Ave N.

Proposed seismic upgrade, including structural bracing and new roof.

Mr. Abelsen recused himself.

Dean Kralios, SMR Architects, explained the proposal for seismic upgrades to improve the building’s life safety status. He explained the proposed work in detail noting that most of the work will take place inside but that some would occur on the exterior; he proceeded to go over detail on the plans.

Ms. Chave explained what features were included in the designating ordinance.

*Ms. Howard arrived at 3:56 p.m.*

There was considerable discussion about the details on the roof and it was agreed that the applicant would provide accurate detail drawings to staff for approval.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, thanked Bethany Church representatives for their stewardship and called the building significant. She supported the proposed work.

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, thanked the church for their stewardship and urged the Board to support the proposed work noting that she wants the building to be around for a long time.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching commented that ARC had reviewed this proposal and noted that the applicant had made a lot of effort to minimize impact to the exterior.

Ms. Wine said that she supported the choice of “storm gray” color shingles over the black.

Mr. Veith noted that the applicant would submit correct roof detail for Staff approval.

Mr. Finrow noted that if additional brick is needed it would need to be approved by the Board.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed seismic upgrade for Bethany Presbyterian Church at 1818 Queen Anne Avenue North, as per the applicant’s submittal. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 112801 as the proposed alterations 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.

The Landmarks Preservation Board expressed its preference for the “Storm Gray” shingles; and the approval is contingent upon submittal of a corrected sheet S5.0 for the full drawing set and the Board expresses its preference for details 2 and 14 and that clarified details 2 and 14 shall be submitted for review to Staff and the Board’s structural engineer to clarify the attachment of the strong back at the base of the chimney; and if possible to avoid cutting the corbel near the base of the chimney; and the board expresses its preference for strong back set back approximate 3” from the side of the chimney.

MM/SC/MH/CH 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Abelsen recused himself.

## **120110.3 DESIGNATIONS**

### **120110.31 RKO Distributing Company Building 2312 Second Avenue**

Mimi Sheridan, architectural historian, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file) and commented on the intactness of the building. She said the store fronts are intact although one has a new door. She pointed out the Batchelder tile, the turned detail on the transom and the Art Deco detail in cast stone. She noted that the rear façade is intact and pointed out the four entries, large windows and small window above. She said that the building is significant because of its history and its materials.

She reported that the building was built in 1928 for Edmond Canedy. Tenants over the years included RKO Pictures, 20<sup>th</sup> Century Fox, Eagle Lions, Paramount, and Camera Craft. She said that film use of the building ended in 1951; a 2<sup>nd</sup> story apartment was in use in 1991.

Ms. Sheridan provided an overview of the history of Film Row noting that film exchanges began in 1905 to rent out film. She said there were 30 film distribution centers across the country. She reported that Seattle was a major film center and shipped films from Alaska to Montana. Film buildings were clustered near 2<sup>nd</sup> and Battery.

Ms. Sheridan went over the film exchange building type which consisted of a sales room film examination room, explosion proof vaults (this building has four), poster room for storage and shipping, screening room and an office and storage room. She said that only three remain in Seattle: the MGM, the Pathé, and the RKO.

Ms. Sheridan showed examples of tile work on other store fronts and said that tile is not commonly used in Seattle - terracotta typically is and that is usually on the bulkheads. She reported that Batchelder tiles are commonly used on fireplaces and interiors and are not common on exteriors. She said that this is the only identified exterior installation of Batchelder tiles in Seattle. She pointed out the three different patterns of tiles on the building.

#### **Board Questions:**

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Sheridan explained that over the 15 years she has been observing this building there have been a lot of art uses. She noted the blacksmith in the back is significant and while the alley façade is not significant now at some point in the future it could be.

Mr. Veith asked if the interior has been modified.

Ms. Sheridan stated that it was less modified than the MGM Building and said that the vaults may still exist in part.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Owner Frank Butler expressed some concern about the landmark process and noted that he and his family have been good stewards of the building. He said that he promotes the art community and provides space at less than market value. He said that they have been proudly independent and don't want anything to negatively impact the artists and the art community. He reported that Pearl Jam and Soundgarden started in the basement. He said that he did not want to remove the skeleton on the skateboard. He commented that he would like to keep the façade and be able to construct a building behind; he noted that he has had some frustration with development rights and credits. He said that one of the vaults still exists.

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

Ms. Howard thanked Mr. Butler for caring for the building and said that it is rare to see one with this much integrity. She also thanked Ms. Sheridan for her report. She noted the tile as significant and also cited Criterion C as significant. She said she agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation based on criteria C and D.

Mr. King supported designation based on the Staff Report, criteria C and D. He noted the building's economic heritage in the region and said that it has great integrity.

Mr. Savage did not support designation and said that Film Row is not significant. He said it is a wonderful example of a mid-block building but that there are others that are similar; he said the building is marginal.

Mr. Veith said it was worth noting the integrity of the street façade and the unique use of the tile. He said it meets Criterion D. He said that Criterion C is not strong and noted that the only significant façade is the street façade. He said that the board typically doesn't make people change anything but does review any future proposed changes. He commented on the importance of the building's continued use and that the board doesn't want to restrict structures any more than it has to. He said that the board doesn't regulate use. He pointed out the development that is occurring behind the façade of the Terminal Sales Annex. He said that the street façade is the feature most needing protection. He said he supported Criterion D and said that he would support designation.

Ms. Wine said the building has integrity; it is modest but proud in the use of tile and vertical components and transom detailing. She said that as the City

goes up around the building its size and modest character will make it stand out more. She said she would support designation based on criteria C and D.

Ms. Wirsching thanked the owner and Ms. Sheridan for their comments. She noted the level of integrity but questioned if the building was able to convey its significance. She said the building does not meet Criterion C. She said the building meets Criterion D noting that the Batchelder tiles, the character of the piers, and the building's integrity provide distinct character. She said that the building conveys significance at the time it was built. She said that she would support designation on Criterion D only.

Mr. Hannum called the building a "jewel box" and said that buildings of this size will become more significant over time. He supported designation based on criteria C and D and he specifically noted the tile work.

Mr. Abelsen noted that some of Mr. Savage's comments were valid about the façade being the primary issue. He said that the tiles are contributing and that the building is distinctive to its period. He did not support Criterion C.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the RKO Distributing Company Building at 2312 Second Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/MH/CH 7:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Savage opposed.

120110.32 Villa Costella  
348 West Olympic Place

Mimi Sheridan prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file) and explained that the building was built in 1928-29 by Everett Beardsley. She reported that tenants had always been primarily managers and professionals. She stated that the building was converted to condos in 1998.

Ms. Sheridan said that the E-shaped plan with courtyards is made up of three connected volumes. The building is terraced with the first floor units having patios, the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor units have terraces, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor units have balconies. She explained that each volume has its own decorative courtyard. She said that what was originally the management office and maid's quarters was converted to a unit as was the janitor's unit. She said that garages that had been in the rear had been demolished and carports built. She said that the units are highly detailed and intact. She said that the only common space is the central stairway in each section.

Ms. Sheridan explained that Spanish Eclectic and Spanish Colonial Revival are the same thing. She showed examples of the wide variety of styles included in Spanish Eclectic noting the stucco with red tile roof, dark wood, round arches, multi-paned windows, courtyard, terraces and balconies.

Ms. Sheridan reported that Everett Beardsley was primarily a contractor and that he did apartment design in the 1920s. She provided photos of his work noting how he made changes to designs to accommodate the site and to provide views.

Ms. Sheridan said that the current landscaping is new (1998 and later); she showed photos of the Mediterranean- type materials.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked about Criterion F.

Ms. Sheridan said that the building is well-known to people who use that street regularly. She said that she was unable to get a photo that adequately shows its prominence on the street.

Mr. Veith asked about a change to the top edge of the central blocks of each metal coping.

Ms. Sheridan said that it isn't clear but that the original photo looks the same.

Ms. Wine asked if the electric fireplaces were original.

Ms. Sheridan said that they were.

Mr. Abelsen had questions about how the landscaping is associated with the building.

Ms. Sheridan commented that the current landscaping is all new (1990's and later).

Ms. Chave said that some elements could be excluded but that could all be discussed at the Controls and Incentives phase.

Mr. Abelsen clarified that the landscaping is significant to the styling and is a contributing aspect.

Candace Carlson, president of the condominium association and representing the owners, said they support designation and noted that the landscape is reflective of the place.

Peggy Gray, condo owner, agreed with Ms. Carlson.

Public Comment:

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, said she supports the designation and noted the wonderful owners who have maintained the building well. She said that the building is prominent and is an important feature and she noted that the owners support designation.

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, said that their board considers the building a landmark. She noted all the landmarks on or near Olympic Place and said it has played an important role in Queen Anne history. She noted the Delamar, the Ankeny House, and Chelsea Hotel and said that Villa Costella fits into that. She commented on the excellent job that was done in converting the building to condos. She explained that before Villa Costella was built this was the site of a house built by John Kinnear, brother of George Kinnear. She urged support for designation.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum said it is a wonderful building and said that regarding Criterion D, the style is unique in Seattle. Regarding Criterion E, he said that it is missing something where it meets the sky; he expressed some hesitation about Criterion F. He supported designation.

Ms. Howard thanked the owners for their great care of the building and Ms. Sheridan for her report. She agreed with Mr. Hannum but said that Criterion F is a “shoe in” because she knows this building and it stands out.

Mr. King said that the building has great integrity and that he supported designation based on criteria D and E.

Mr. Savage said that he would support designation based on criteria D and E. He said that the E-shape floor plan is well thought out.

Mr. Veith said that he was not sure that this was outstanding work or that it is prominent enough or contrasts enough to meet Criterion F. He said the building has crisp and nicely maintained detailing and a distinctive building scheme. He said that the typology is distinctive and that he would support designation based on Criterion D.

Ms. Wine said that the building clearly has significance and integrity and that she supported Criterion D. She said that she is not familiar enough with Beardsley but said that she agreed that Criterion F was appropriate because she has always noticed the building. She supported designation.

Ms. Wirsching said that she doesn't know the site and did not tour it so is relying on her colleagues. She said that this is one of the last remaining of Beardsley's apartments. She supported designation based on criteria D, E and F.

Mr. Abelsen supported designation and noted it embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style. He said it is a significant work by Beardsley and noted that the building is locally visible and stands out. He polled members on which of the criteria they supported and the majority supported criteria D, E, and F.

Mr. Veith said regarding Controls the site is often included – not always because it is especially significant or because it might become significant but because changes to the site can affect one's appreciation of the building. In this case, because of the way it is situated the site does affect how one appreciates the building. He said that regarding F it doesn't affect the buildings around it or your experience of the street enough to meet this requirement. It takes an approach that was common in its period; it doesn't stand out as spatial element in neighborhood but it adds to it.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Villa Costella at 348 West Olympic Place a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building and the site.

MM/SC/EW/MH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

#### **120110.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

120110.41 YWCA Building  
1118 Fifth Avenue  
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a 90-day extension.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the YWCA Building at 1118 Fifth Avenue for a period of 90 days.

MM/SC/TV/MW 8:0:0 Motion carried.

120110.42 Galbraith House  
1729 17<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Request for extension

Ms. Chave explained the request for a 90-day extension.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Galbraith House at 1729 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. for a period of 90 days.

MM/SC/TV/CH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

120110.43 George Washington Carmack House  
1522 E. Jefferson Street  
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a 90-day extension.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the George Washington Carmack House at 1522 E. Jefferson Street for a period of 90 days.

MM/SC/TV/SS 8:0:0 Motion carried.

**120110.5 BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Chave reported that 2011 meeting schedules for full board and ARC will be posted online. She announced that a tour is scheduled for next Wednesday December 8.

**120110.6 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator