



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 43/10

### MINUTES

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

#### Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen, Chair  
Tom Veith, Vice Chair  
Marie Strong  
Meredith Wirsching  
Steve Savage  
Jerry Finrow  
Elaine Wine  
Christine Howard  
Aaron Luoma  
Patrick King

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Melinda Bloom  
Rebecca Frestedt

#### Absent

Alyce Conti  
Mark Hannum

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

### **020310.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES** Meeting of December 16, 2009

#### Public Disclosure/Disclaimer Statement

Consistent with the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, all records within the possession of the City may be subject to a public disclosure request and may be distributed or copied. Records include and are not limited to sign-in sheets, contracts, emails, notes, correspondence, etc. Use of lists of individuals or directory information (including address, phone or E-mail) may not be used for commercial purposes.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

MM/SC/TV/CH 7:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Mr. Luoma abstained.

*Mr. Finrow arrived at 3:35 p.m.*

*Ms. Wine arrived at 3:36 p.m.*

**020310.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

020310.21 3815 S. Edmunds St.  
(Columbia City Landmark District)  
Preliminary design of a three story commercial building including a one story glass atrium

Rebecca Frestedt provided background information on the project. She said the proposed development consists of preliminary design of a new three (3) story hotel building to be located adjacent to the existing Shirley Marvin Apartment Building. The site for the proposed development is currently used as parking for tenants of the Shirley Marvin. The development is part of a larger plan which includes converting the existing four (4) Shirley Marvin apartments into hotel units. Combined, the new construction and converted apartments will result in eight (8) units. Parking will be located off-site at 4860 Rainier Ave. S.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the lot is zoned NC3-40. She said the Shirley Marvin apartment building was constructed in 1935 and is a contributing building to the District. The single-family D.C. Brown residence to the east was constructed in 1900 and is a contributing building to the local District. She confirmed that a Master Use Permit (MUP) is required due to the number of units on the lot. The Department of Planning and Development issued a Determination of Non-Significance on January 10, 2010. No conditions associated with the SEPA decision have been imposed. The Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the Preliminary Design proposal on September 25, 2009 and voted to recommend approval for the proposed Preliminary Design.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the applicant, Philip Christofides of Arellano Christofides, is requesting approval for Preliminary Design of a three (3) story lodging building and one (1) story glass atrium at 3815 S. Edmunds St. She provided a chronology of this application for Board review (available in DON file).

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Christofides provided context of the site and pointed out the “ABAB” rhythm of the block and large side setbacks of 13 – 17’ between buildings. He went over options that had been explored and explained why the proposed

option was selected. He explained the plan to create a forecourt with a glazed link to connect the Shirley Marvin apartments to the new building. He said the space will be developed as semi-public space that is a transition from the sidewalk and the pedestrian environment to the more private spaces of the hotel. He said the intent is to enliven block and the neighborhood, while being respectful to the D. C. Brown residence. He said the first proposals considered had the building right on the property line without fenestration, which was not allowed by building code. He said the CCRC recommended to include windows, setbacks or some form of articulation. He said they propose pulling the building 1' off the property line and then creating recessed bays – “niches” that would go back to a 3' setback off the property line so they can articulate the deep building into a barbell shape. Pedestrians would see a breakdown of the form. He explained that coincidentally the adjacent D. C. Brown house had been moved to that location from the existing Shirley Marvin site. The house will be framed by more traditional commercial buildings.

Mr. Christofides explained the new building base will be exactly the same height as the Shirley Marvin base with the third story pushed back and the top floor – a single guest unit – pulled back at the sides. He said the multi-purpose atrium would link the new to the old building; he was not sure if the atrium would be heated or not.

Ms. Frestedt reminded the Board that this application was for preliminary design approval for bulk, massing and scale. She said that despite the level of detail shown on the renderings that all finishes, materials and landscaping would come under the final design approval

Mr. Christofides said that CCRC members expressed concern that the high concrete wall on the north elevation was too severe to be against the sidewalk and suggested that glazing coming down to the floor. He said they are addressing that at the MUP level.

Mr. Abelsen asked the applicants if what was being shown in the packet that Board members had was different from what was in the MUP application.

Mr. Christofides stated it is the same as what is in the MUP and referred to the permit plan sets that had been distributed by Ms. Frestedt.

Board Questions:

In response to a question about NC zone requirements Mr. Christofides explained that there is a preference for buildings within the zone to be built to the property line.

Mr. Veith said the bulk and scale were fine but said the two windows look like they are trying to be doors or store fronts. He said that since it is a lounge and more residential he wouldn't mind if the sills were higher.

Mr. Christofides said that the transparency requirement within this zone is to maintain 80% transparency between 2' and 8'. He said a door on the north facade didn't make sense given the proportions on that building and that the core orients toward Rainier which is a key intersection in the district. He said he views the west façade as being three dimensional – it is right on the sidewalk, it turns the corner and faces west and the face of the atrium which is oriented toward the commercial district.

Mr. Veith said he understood the requirement to almost look like a store front.

Mr. Abelsen asked how the applicants will address the transparency requirement along a sloping sidewalk.

Mr. Veith said that the windows on the east side looked proportionately different from the windows elsewhere. He noted the windows on the west façade over the connector on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor are lighting a stairwell.

Mr. Christofides agreed and said the tall ribbon of glass is the interior vertical circulation for the hotel.

Ms. Wirsching asked if there was an attempt to align the windows with the existing building.

Mr. Christofides said no, however the alignment of the windows could be adjusted in final design.

Mr. Luoma said he thought with the design of the top unit the applicant was attempting to nod toward the D. C. Brown house and its color. He commented on the CCRC's concern about the relationship to that house. Besides the overall height and possibly the width he asked if there were any other identifying connections between the design of the top unit and the D.C. Brown house.

Mr. Christofides said it was not so much an interest in relating to it as to giving it room to breathe and not turning a blank wall to it.

Ms. Frestedt said there may be additional ways to relate to the adjacent property through final design.

Mr. Christofides said the height of the 3<sup>rd</sup> story is 2' below the peak of the D. C. Brown house; it would not be the same height and he noted they eyeballed the height of the D. C. Brown house counting shingles. He reiterated that the

intent is for the top of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor parapet to be lower than the D. C. Brown house cross gable.

There was discussion about the height of the 3<sup>rd</sup> story unit and some board members thought the height looked taller than the house on the 3-D board. Applicants stated that was a misrepresentation and reiterated that the height would be under the peak of the D. C. Brown house.

Mr. Abelsen asked about minimizing the height of the third story and suggested exploring options that reduce the height of the third story in the current design.

Mr. Finrow said it was a good job and that it fits in well. He suggested exploring a hipped roof on the flat section of the roof so it would have some gesture to the house. He noted the surface level of the brick relative to the historic house and the Shirley Marvin building and suggested exploring lines of the façade and how they interface with the Shirley Marvin. He said in flat on elevation it looked like they are sharing the same vocabulary and line but they actually are not.

Ms. Frestedt explained the decision not to go to ARC for preliminary sign, given the relative simplicity of the proposal but she stated that it would be appropriate that final design for this project would go before ARC prior to full board review.

Mr. Christofides said they had started thinking that the flat roof was most appropriate because this structure was more similar to the dominant commercial and apartment buildings in the area. He said they looked at modern forms and explained how they came to a flat roof. He said he was intrigued by the comment about the alignment of the façade of the Shirley Marvin having more of a relationship with the new proposal and they definitely plan to study that. He said that maybe that will somehow be reflected in how we deal with the tall circulation glazing strip. He said he was also intrigued by the discussion of materials and said it might be nice to mimic the lap siding on the D. C. Brown and apply it to the modern building with traces of things going on next door.

Mr. Abelsen said he had no objection to the height at the brick and stated that that is the applicant's design decision. He noted that the application is for preliminary design approval for bulk, massing and scale and that materiality will be discussed in future presentations to the ARC.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said the solution was good and that he liked that the brick component of the new structure is similar in character and height to the existing structure. He said he had no issue with the details as rendered and that there was no need to make a slope roof component on the new structure to deal with the house. He said he thought they were headed in the right direction. He said if he were to make a gesture to the house he would take all pieces clad as the 3<sup>rd</sup> story and make it thicker at the back of the building so it would be about the same depth of the house. He said he didn't have any concerns with what is proposed. He suggested using plantings to make connections from house to new building.

Ms. Howard agreed and liked the whole block approach in considering the massing and that it is a very elegant solution.

Ms. Wine agreed and said it was compositionally successful in respecting the neighborhood in bulk, massing and scale. She said it is a nice gesture to the house next door and the flat roof solution makes the house stand out as its own element. She suggested in terms of the gesture perhaps exploration of materials or datum lines.

Mr. Savage said it seemed like the little house was disappearing in a sea of brick, but he said he understood the need to pull back to the property line and said he thought the scale and massing were appropriate.

Mr. Luoma said the massing and scale seemed compatible with the block and district in its height, width and its distance from the curb. He said the 3<sup>rd</sup> story was an opportunity for further exploration of materials. He noted that the large massing with brick was dominant in relation to the little house and the 3<sup>rd</sup> story was a unique opportunity to look at more compatible materials and the whole block being seen as one as opposed to the little house being lost in a sea of brick.

Ms. Wirsching concurred and said the new building - by connecting to the Shirley Marvin - tells her that it wants more of a relationship with the Shirley Marvin. She pointed out the value of material studies both in relation to the house and also 3-D studies of the site to better understand the relationships.

Mr. Abelsen stated the "ABAB" rhythm approach in the design of the street-facing building elevation is successful and graphically expressed well. The applicants' exploration of material choices, to be viewed at a later date, will be significant and helpful in the Board's ability to see the effect, and for gaining an understanding of the applicant's design process. He said that overall this is a great addition and noting the potential impact to the house appears to be minimal. He said that this is a historic district where there is a continual give and take between existing buildings in the District and the

proposed addition to adjacent properties, and keeping the landmarked building demonstrates a respect to the historic character of the District.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Preliminary Design for a three story building with 4 lodging units and a one-story glass atrium at 3815 S. Edmunds St. as described in the application submittal and submitted plans.

**This approval is conditional upon Board review and approval of all construction drawings, finishes and details necessary for a final Certificate of Approval.**

This action is based on the following:

**Relevant Code citations:**

**Columbia City Landmark District Ordinance**

- 25.20.020 Legislative findings and purposes
- 25.20.040 C. Criteria for designation of the District – Architectural
- 25.20.070 Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property
- 25.20.080 Application for certificate of approval
- 25.20.090 B. Board meeting on Certificate of Approval

**Columbia City Design Guidelines/General**

6. New construction should be compatible with existing development in terms of scale, materials and setback.

**Columbia City Design Guidelines/Specific**

- 1. Scale of Buildings and Structures. The scale of all structures in relationship to other structures and spaces is important. The scale should continue to be small and relatively uniform.
- 13. New Construction

**Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation #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/TV/CH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

020310.22 Terry Avenue Building  
320 Terry Avenue North  
Proposed exterior alterations

Rachel Ben Schmuell, owner's representative, introduced Peter Krech and Michael Medina, from Callison Architecture and Monte Fairweather and Don Cooper from Fairweather Masonry. She stated they were seeking Board approval for a Certificate of Approval.

Peter Krech provided an overview of the project and context of the site and went over the historic conditions of the building. He said the work would be primarily on the exterior with the focus on the east and west facades. He said they proposed to reinforce the existing character of those facades with more flexibility because they were originally party walls. He said the brick would be cleaned and repaired, they would be retrofitting the existing upper double windows on the west façade and reglazing with new glass, replacing the windows on the lower level and on the east façade the windows are being replaced. The project has a green roof created on the roof and a series of new openings on the south façade would be made. He pointed out the plaza area in which they propose to plant a specimen tree – a Scarlett Oak – and a proposed green wall at the south end. A portion of the plaza will be used for outdoor dining by the restaurant tenant but the majority is open to the public. He explained that the plaza allows entry at the first floor level and a secondary entry as the site grades up. They propose to maintain four window openings and there are three new openings to the plaza on the south side. The 2<sup>nd</sup> floor has the four primary openings respected on the west façade along Terry Avenue and they now daylight on to terrace on the intermediate level. There are three new openings on the south on the plaza.

Mr. Krech described the extensive green roof which will have 4 – 6" of planting medium with different colored species. Four skylights will replace the existing ones which were installed in the 1970s and they propose going back to metal as was originally used. A small elevator and air handling penthouse will be installed further back on the roof adjacent to new construction so it will be less visible from Terry Avenue.

He said that a window survey had been done and that some windows would be replaced and others retrofitted. The windows on the back of the building will be replaced with double hung wood windows which will be a Marvin product, all wood with a simulated divided light on new windows only. The simulated divided light window has the appearance of true divided light and keeps the same profile as the existing windows.

He said they looked at seismic bracing options and said the original concept was to do an X bracing configuration. He pointed out the locations of the bracing noting that they were able move two braces inward so they are not visible from the façade and which will also free up windows for dining tables. He said moment frames were considered but determined not to be workable. He noted the tenant's desire to leave the steel bracing unpainted and said it would be a dark color; he provided a sample.

On the south elevation he said they would open up bricked up openings and said that C-channels would be installed over the heads of the openings. He said they would use a more contemporary window design having a reference to the new building and said there would be canopies over the windows. He went over photos of the south side elevation noting the 1930s ghost sign, a 1975 sign and graffiti and showed where the new openings would be. The new openings would take out a lot of the ghost sign. He said they would attempt to remove as much of the graffiti as possible without damaging brick.

Mr. Krech said the lighting would be simple metal down lights in five locations along Terry Avenue and noted they would also add some aim-able fixtures. He went over the proposed materials and said they would respect what was old and the new would be clearly new. He explained that precast coping and sills will be replaced to match the color of the existing concrete. He provided steel samples and went over colors noting the dark graphite gray color which is being proposed for the new steel canopies and headers over the existing windows.

He said the new windows on the south façade will be graphite color which matches the window color throughout the rest of the project. He explained the need to meet energy code and noted that because substantial portions of the interior of the project will be left brick it will be difficult. The green roof and party walls help get the project to 50% of the energy code which is allowable for a historic building. To get to the 50% they have had to go to an insulated glass and low-e coating which will provide a slight color to the glass. He said they propose a low iron ultralite glass and he provided samples for Board review.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen complimented the applicants on a very good process noting it was a good model for others.

Ms. Wirsching asked about the braced frame location back and whether the new precast cornice and sill would match the existing.

Mr. Krech said one brace frame would be one bay in and the one furthest west is in a few inches from the windows. He said that the precast cornice and sill would match the existing profile.

Mr. Finrow asked why they were putting in awnings.

Mr. Krech said it was due to the desire to open operable windows and awnings allow them to be open in inclement weather and also protects the windows. He said the building does not have a scaling element at the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

and he thought the awnings added to the character by reinforcing the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor line. It also provided the ability for tenants to have signage or lighting.

Mr. Finrow stated he didn't like it but would still support the application. He said it is a simple warehouse building and eyelids will be irritating.

Mr. Veith reported that at ARC there were different configurations for the overhangs on the west side façade and the direction ARC provided was that as long as they were within the window opening and not interfering with the continuity of the brick façade that they would be acceptable. He said he thought the applicants had achieved that. The awnings are attached to the window frame in the window opening.

Responding to Board questions Mr. Krech said due to the low height of the building access will be via ladder. The green roof will be irrigated. The elevator penthouse height is 8' from the top of the roof and said there is water proofing medium up to the top of the parapet; the details are shown on the most up to date drawing. Staff had drawings that are correct.

Mr. Abelsen asked the masonry contractor about east and west facades.

Monte Fairweather, Fairweather Masonry, explained the need to do testing first and pointed out due to differing conditions over the years each façade would have a different patina. He said they would begin with a mild cleaning and see how that works. He said the work would involve cleaning mostly but about 25% tuck pointing and that they would know more definitively once they get the scaffolding up.

Ms. Wirsching asked about the pressure washing spec and asked if above 400 PSI was a problem.

Mr. Fairweather said that they would definitely start below 400 PSI; the plan was to start small and work up. He said the area where windows will be cut in can be used as a test spot since that brick will be coming out. His preference is to do the path of least resistance and said the brick will be clean but not pristine.

Mr. Krech pointed out there are four different types of brick and cleaning methods – soap and water, pressure wash, chemicals – would be incremental starting with the least obtrusive way possible and working up as necessary. Responding to questions about the windows he explained that the simulated divided light has an aluminum spacer in it and said he thought it was pretty convincing.

Mr. Finrow asked if the Terry Avenue sign would remain and although the applicant said he thought the sign dated from the 1980s Mr. Finrow said he

thought it was interesting and suggested verifying the date; he thought perhaps it should be kept. He encouraged the applicant to not hang anything off the canopies.

Ms. Howard asked why the canopy on the south was wider toward the west.

Mr. Krech said it is an important part of the circulation strategy noting the staggered orientation of the thru-block connection and said they did their best to reinforce the diagonal movement and the canopy follows the same diagonal line. He said that the cable rod extended canopy was in keeping with the spirit of the warehouse that it once was.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith reported that the application had been reviewed several times at ARC which as a group was happy with how the scheme developed especially on the south façade. He said it was appropriate that new openings and appliances attached to the building were non-referential to the historic building. He noted that on the front façade they removed the changes rendering it similar to the original façade with adjustments to make it workable. He supported the application.

Ms. Howard said she liked how integrated the historic structure is to the entire development.

Mr. Abelsen said the process was well done and it was sensitive to the landmarked building. He cautioned to be careful with the brick cleaning and said the incremental approach was good and requested a report back.

Ms. Wirsching agreed that a “report back” on the incremental cleaning of the brick was warranted.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report as the proposed work does 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/MW/JF 9:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Savage recused himself.

Mr. Krech noted the possible DPD push back on energy code requirements. Ms. Sodt will draft a letter for the Board chair's signature.

### **020310.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

#### **020310.31 Harborview Medical Center—Center Wing of East Hospital 326 Ninth Avenue**

Ms. Sodt explained the owners' request for an extension until February 17, 2010.

Action: I move to approve an extension for Harborview Medical Center to February 17, 2010.

MM/SC/JF/CH 10:0:0 Motion carried.

### **020310.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Chave reported that two new nominations had been added to the website: SPU – Crawford Hall and a house near Providence Hospital – 536 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Both nominations were submitted by the owner as part of their SEPA process.

Ms. Chave said that past chair Steve Lee wanted to provide the board a tour of the Josephinum Building.

### **020310.5 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator