



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 558/10

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, December 15, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Karen Gordon
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Betsy Jacobson
Patrick King

Chair Vernon Abelsen called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

121510.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 3, 2010

MM/SC/JF/TV

4:0:3 Minutes approved as amended. Messrs. Abelsen and Savage and Ms. Wine abstained.

121510.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

121510.21 240 Second Ave S.
(Pioneer Square District)

Karen Gordon went over the Special Tax Valuation program and said that the applicant met the requirements of the program; \$17,357,966 was spent on improvements to the building. She said the applicant is still doing tenant improvements but the work included in this program is done. She explained that the applicant also received federal tax credits.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 240 Second Avenue South, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based upon the recommendation of the Pioneer Square Preservation Board which made the following findings at its meeting of December 15, 2010, that the property is a contributing building located in the Pioneer Square Preservation District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the Pioneer Square Preservation District; and that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the District; and has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application, and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

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

121510.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

121510.31 Columbia Branch Library
4721 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City Landmark District)
Proposed installation of mechanical equipment and screening

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of two (2) outdoor split system air conditioning condensing units and relocation of one (1) existing condensing unit. Proposal includes installation of a screening wall, gate and extended landscaping on the northern edge of the property. Exhibits included photographs and plans. The Columbia Branch Library is a contributing building within the Columbia City Landmark District. The Landmarks Preservation Board issued a Certificate of Approval for Final Design of the western addition in 2003. On December 7, 2010 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee reviewed the proposal. The Committee supported the location of the proposed screening wall, set back 8” from the original building and the 2003 addition. She said that the Review Committee

requested photographs of the mechanical area from the interior to ensure that the proposal would not create an adverse visual impact. The Committee inquired about the modifications to the window on the lower level necessary to accommodate the equipment. Ms. Frestedt said the Committee recommended differentiating the design of the gate from the existing ornamental gate. The applicant's revisions are included in the final application.

Applicant Comment:

Glenn Osaka, Seattle Public Library, introduced Erik Salisbury, from Miller Hayashi Architects.

Mr. Salisbury reiterated Ms. Frestedt's comments and went through details noting that the proposed concrete wall will be set back 8" from the historic portion of the building and they will add a black painted steel access gate. He said the existing landscaping will screen the area they will extend the shrubs to minimize the view. He said the concrete portion is butting up against the historic building with a cold joint and the gate assembly will not penetrate the historic building.

Mr. Abelsen commented that he sat in on the Columbia City Review Committee meeting and that the presentation was reasonable; he said that the proposed addition appropriately relates more to the later addition.

Mr. Veith asked if the window with the conduit was in the basement of the original building.

Mr. Osaka said it is in the west facing wall of the alcove of the original building.

Mr. Salisbury said that two windows were retrofitted. He said they would pull one of the glazing units out and replace it with a painted fiber cement panel that will be finished to match existing bare concrete. Responding to board member question he said that the new wall would be a cantilever wall that will butt up against the historic wall and attach with a cold joint.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said the proposal is appropriate; the new wall abuts the existing and it is not real visible from Columbia Park.

Mr. Finrow said it is good to see it set back.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations for the Columbia Branch Library at 4721 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior alterations 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

12. Additions to Existing Buildings.

a. All new additions, penthouses, and building systems shall be located to allow the architectural and historic qualities of the building to be dominant when viewed from the public right-of-way or other primary viewpoints.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

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

#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.

#10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

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

121510.32 The Josephinum
1902 Second Avenue
Proposed signage

Ms. Sodt briefly described the proposal and introduced Steve Zamberlin, National Sign Corporation.

Mr. Zamberlin explained that he changed the copy for better visibility and noted the vehicular and pedestrian use; he said the sign would be installed a bit higher. He said that the overall display size is 2' x 6' to correlate with the architectural elements. He said that the color will closely match the color of the window mullion.

Mr. Hannum arrived at 3:55 p.m.

Mr. Zamberlin reported that the sign will be illuminated. It will be a standard box type with fluorescent light inside. He said that 12 square feet is relatively small and he noted that there is no commercial signage on the building.

Mr. Veith asked if the cable issues had been resolved.

Mr. Zamberlin said the sign is below that area. He said the anchors will go into the mortar joints, below the trolley lines. He said that the mortar plates will match the brick.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said she was glad that the letters are larger and there is less white on the sign. She said the sign is sensitive to the historic fabric and the design of the sign does not pull from any elements.

Mr. Veith said that ARC had a little concern but he noted that it is a sign that can be removed, and it is attached appropriately.

Mr. Hannum said it was straightforward.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage, per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 114770 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale 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/MW/MS 9:0:0 Motion carried.

121510.33

Sigma Kappa Mu House

4510 NE 65th St.

Renewal of previously issued C of A for window replacement

Ms. Chave explained that the applicants had done some work approved in the 2009 C of A, but not all of the proposed work, and were now requesting a renewal of the Certificate of Approval.

Ellen Mirro, Johnson Partnership, explained said that the east wing basement and main floor windows have been replaced and next they plan to do the 3rd floor east and west wings. She said they are using the aluminum windows approved by the Board in the 2009 C of A. She reported that they are about 50% complete and they have had no problems thus far. She said that the permit had been renewed and they just needed the Certificate of Approval renewed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Hannum found the application acceptable.

Ms. Wirsching said there was no problem.

Mr. Abelsen said the application was reasonable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the renewal of the application for the following, as per the applicant's submittal:

- Replace all windows in East Wing
- Replace two existing doors in the East Wing dining room
- Replace all third floor aluminum windows and one second floor aluminum window in the West Wing

This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 122469 as the proposed work meets 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 proposed for replacement. The design of the replacement windows is compatible with the landmark building and closely matches the design of the original windows.

In addition, the significance of the windows in the East Wing (the 1962 addition) was addressed in the Controls and Incentives agreement and in Ordinance #122469.

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

MM/SC/SS/CH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

121510.34 902 Montana Circle
(Fort Lawton Landmark District)
Paving of existing unpaved driveway

Ms. Chave explained where the proposed work would take place. She said that the Fort Lawton Guidelines are not completed at this time so the work requires a Certificate of Approval.

Michael Nanney, property manager, explained that in the Montana Circle area there are just two duplex units that are brick with the rest being wood siding. He explained that the proposed driveway will match the one at the other brick duplex. He said that currently the driveway is not delineated with people beginning to park on the green (grass). He said that the asphalt will have a smaller footprint than the existing gravel driveway and the asphalt will better differentiate between driveway and green (grass). He said the asphalt edge will be saw cut down about 3" and the extra gravel on the side will be removed and replaced with topsoil and then grassed. He said the edges will be neat and they will be replacing the sidewalk. He noted that they will replace sidewalks throughout the area due to tree uplift and age wear and tear. He said that no concrete work is planned unless runoff curb channel needs replacement.

Mr. Abelsen commented that there would be two different standards.

Mr. Nanney explained they are trying to drive toward consistency.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said that the detailing requirement would be satisfied by submitting a photo of a channel that has already been replaced as well as the place where the asphalt meets the grass. He said they could just be submitted to staff.

Ms. Wirsching said that the written description is good regarding the asphalt and grass so there is a clear record of the work for future reference.

Mr. Veith said the work is appropriate and the idea of having a defined edge is in keeping with the character of a military installation – simple and clean.

Mr. Abelsen said that the asphalt is not an improvement but it is cleaner.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the paving of the existing unpaved driveway at 902 Montana Circle. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed paving does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #122750 as the proposed paving does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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*.

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

MM/SC/MS/CH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Veith made an amendment that the approval be conditional upon the applicant providing to staff a photo of the existing replacement drainage channel, and the asphalt edge against the grass, and a written description of the asphalt and substrate.

MM/SC/TV/CH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

121510.4 DESIGNATIONS

121510.41 Lexington-Concord Apartments 2402-2408 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained that the Lexington-Concord Apartment building is a Category 1 building.

Mimi Sheridan, architectural historian, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). She noted that at the nomination meeting the Board had asked how the building relates to the development of housing in Belltown. She provided context of Belltown and noted that there were three regrades: the first in 1898, the 2nd (the big one) from 1903-11 and the 3rd from 1928-30.

She explained that Belltown was originally developed by William Bell. She said that three buildings from the area's early development – 1887-1890 - remain. She said that after the regrade SRO hotels developed on First Avenue; about 10 are left, many of which are landmarks. She said by 1917 the area was Seattle's coming retail and apartment district.

Ms. Sheridan explained that between Lenora and Denny are 17 extant single use apartment buildings that were developed after the regrade. The apartments target downtown workers with modest incomes. She said the small units – mostly studios – were different from SROs and had a kitchen and bathroom. She said there were no high end buildings and little parking. She said that many of the buildings have integrity issues and bad window replacements citing the Humphrey and Cornelius buildings.

Ms. Sheridan explained that the area around the buildings is intact with low level buildings. She said that the Lexington was built in 1923 and the Concord in 1924 and pointed out that the unusual double building is separate on the inside but joined on the outside. She provided examples of other double buildings.

Ms. Sheridan said that Henry Hudson did many buildings including the Lowell-Emerson and the John Alden. She said there are two entrances to the building with archways on each floor. She noted the iron balconies, prominent cornice, courtyard, tapestry brick on the front with the rear faced with common brick. She noted the building's high integrity.

She said the building meets Criterion D and embodies the Colonial Revival style. She said that it is symmetrical in form and noted the double hung windows with multi-paned glazing and accentuated front entry. She pointed out the fanlight sidelights, cornice with dentils and round arched openings. She noted the arched windows with tracery at entry and the intact 12/1 windows. She said it is an excellent example of a 1920 apartment building and an excellent example of Colonial Revival as expressed in an apartment building.

Board Questions:

Mr. Savage asked about the brick horizontal banding.

Ms. Sheridan said that it is not unique and is a feature seen in a number of nicely designed apartment building. She said it was a way to break up lengths and was a period issue from the 1920s.

Mr. Finrow asked if there were other Colonial Revival apartments in Seattle.

Ms. Sheridan said that there are several others and noted that this one is very good and has high integrity. She cited the Fairmount and said there were others that have more applied ornamentation.

Mr. Finrow said that the south side of the building is unimaginative and marginal and just the First Avenue side is significant.

Ms. Sheridan pointed out the long façade without extra entries to break it up noting this is where windows and courses of brick are so important.

Mr. Veith asked how one distinguishes this building from a simple Italianate or American Renaissance building.

Ms. Sheridan explained that it has some of the same features but noted that 12/1 windows speak of Colonial Revival more. She said that the shape of the balconies is unusual and more eclectic. She said that apartment buildings are often box-designed because of the need to get the value out of the land.

Mr. Veith asked about the typology of efficiency apartments and if this building was distinguishable from the Windham.

Ms. Sheridan said that the Windham, at seven stories, is taller. She said this building, like most in the City, is a three-story walk up.

Mr. Veith noted the building's high integrity.

Mr. Veith noted there are just two public sides.

Ms. Wirsching asked if Belltown apartments are typically SROs.

Ms. Sheridan said they are efficiency apartments.

Owner Comment:

Sue Sherbrooke, YWCA Director, said if the building is designated she looked forward to Controls and Incentives as that is where they will work out values between historic preservation and housing regulation agreements; she stressed the need for balance. She said the building was preserved by the Seattle Housing levy.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Finrow said that the integrity is good and it is a good building and shows what it was originally which is unique and important especially when so many other apartments have seen declines. He said the design and architecture is marginally Colonial Revival but not great. He said it is good but noted the high degree of integrity. He said the building is marginally strong on Criterion D and he said he would vote for it noting its integrity.

Mr. Hannum agreed with Mr. Finrow and said it has questionable landmark status but does meet D and he noted the intact detailing and integrity. He supported designation.

Ms. Howard agreed and said she would support designation based on Criterion D noting it does embody the style and its integrity pushes it into significance.

Mr. Savage wasn't sure but said the building is distinctive of its period more than its style. He said it has terrific integrity.

Ms. Strong agreed with Mr. Finrow. She noted a dilemma but said based on the size of the building, its use and integrity she would support designation.

Mr. Veith said the building embodies many components of the architecture of its period. He said there is no criterion for typology that fits it best. He said it has high integrity, but that he would not support designation.

Mr. Abelsen asked Mr. Veith about typology.

Mr. Veith said that typology is a way of talking about or describing building form in comparison to other buildings of the same type. He said it connects some design characteristics with functional characteristics of the building. He said that this building – a building primarily of studio apartments – shares characteristics with other buildings of similar use that are clad with stylistic elements. He said it is an example of its type with high integrity. He said that whether it is distinctive is questionable. He said that it is not distinctive but has the appeal of high integrity.

Ms. Wine said that the building has integrity in terms of being an apartment building typology. She said it has integrity and character but not the distinct visible character of Colonial Revival. She said that there is a lack of significance because the building doesn't make a big splash but that as an apartment typology or period piece she would support designation.

Ms. Wirsching said that the building has integrity commented that she agreed with Mr. Veith's comments. She said that the building is attractive and has integrity it is not distinctive and not worthy of landmark status.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Lexington-Concord Apartments at 2402-2408 2nd 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 5:4:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Veith and Savage and
Mmes. Strong and Wirsching opposed.

Ms. Howard left at 5:20 p.m.

121510.5 NOMINATIONS

121510.51 Cascade Natural Gas Corporation Building
222 Fairview Avenue North

Mr. Veith recused himself.

Larry Johnson, Johnson Partnership, reported that the building owners plan to develop the site and prefer it not be designated. He explained that the building was constructed in stages the first being in 1957, second in 1962 and the third and final stage in 1975. He said that the building is neither prominent nor noticeable and sits behind a concrete wall with a parking lot in front. He said that the façade and the painted steel louvers on the windows are from the 1962 addition. The connecting link between this and the Machenheimer buildings was added in the 1980s.

Mr. Johnson went through the interiors noting that a demonstration kitchen is now used as a lunchroom and the nicest area is the executive waiting area. He went over the historic context of the building citing Immanuel Lutheran and St. Spiridan, Jensen Block, Grandview Apartments, Metropolitan and Troy Laundry buildings as significant historic buildings in the area. He said the building is not an outstanding work of architects Lamont and Fey and cited the Evans Pool addition to the Greenlake Field house as a better example of their work. He said the building does not meet any of the criteria for designation. Responding to clarifying questions he said he wasn't sure if Cascade Natural Gas had any relationship to the Coal Gasification plant at Union Station location and that it had no relationship at all to Puget Sound Energy. He reported that the infrastructure they laid down in the 1950s and 1960s is still in use.

Public Comment: There is no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching agreed with the Staff Report and did not support nomination. She said there were other buildings that are similar stylistically but better.

Ms. Wine said the louvers are applied and out of context. She said the most integrity is on the interior and there is not enough there to landmark. She agreed with the Staff Report and would not support nomination.

Ms. Strong agreed with the Staff Report and did not support nomination.

Mr. Savage said the building is unremarkable and he agreed with the Staff Report.

Mr. Hannum agreed with Ms. Wine's comments and said that the louvers are the most interesting part and they are applied. He did not support nomination.

Mr. Finrow did not support nomination.

Mr. Abelsen said the initial construction is closest to International Style and the louvers deteriorated that. He did not support nomination.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Cascade Natural Gas Corporation Building at 222 Fairview Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the Staff Report.

MM/SC/SS/MH 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Veith recused himself.

Mr. Savage left at 6:00 p.m.

121510.52 Machenheimer Building
230 Fairview Avenue North

Larry Johnson provided context of the area and said the entry lintel, railings, glazing and skybridge were all added in the 1980s. The interior was stripped down in the 1980s and the only original element is the interior stairs. He said architect Bob Dietz did a number of small residential projects, schools, Emmanuel Episcopal Church and Schmitz Hall; this is not a significant work of his. He said the building did not meet any of the criteria for designation and said it has no integrity.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members did not support nomination with each noting the lack of integrity.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Machenheimer Building located at 230 Fairview Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the Staff Report.

MM/SC/MW/JF 7:0:0 Motion carried.

121510.6 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

121510.61 Pacific Science Center
200 2nd Ave N
Request for extension

Ms. Chave presented the owner's request for a three month extension

Action: I move that the Board approve a three month extension for the consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Pacific Science Center.

MM/SC/JF/MW 9:0:0 Motion carried.

121510.62 Admiral's House
2001 W. Garfield St.
Request for extension

Action: I move that the Board approve an extension for the consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Admiral's House to the first meeting in February 2011.

MM/SC/JF/MS 9:0:0 Motion carried.

121510.63 Seattle Japanese Language School
1414 S. Weller St.
Request for extension

Action: I move that the Board approve a three month extension for the consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Japanese Language School.

MM/SC/JF/MW 9:0:0 Motion carried.

121510.7 BOARD BUSINESS

121510.8 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator