



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 82/10

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, March 17, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen, Chair
Mark Hannum
Patrick King
Aaron Luoma
Marie Strong
Tom Veith, Vice Chair
Elaine Wine
Meredith Wirsching

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Karen Gordon
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Alyce Conti
Jerry Finrow
Christine Howard
Steve Savage

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

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"

031710.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of February 3, 2010 were deferred.

Meeting of February 17, 2010

Mr. Abelsen and Ms. Wirsching sent amendments to the minutes via email.

Mr. Veith provided amendments at the meeting.

MM/SC/TV/MW 8:0:0 Minutes approved as amended.

031710.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

031710.21 First Church of Christ, Scientist

1519 E. Denny Way

Ms. Gordon gave the staff report. She circulated photos and explained the Special Tax Valuation program and reported that the applicant had met the requirements.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: First Church, 1841 16th Avenue, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property 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.

031710.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

031710.31 4800 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City Landmark District)
Proposed signage revisions

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed revision to existing business identification signage and modifications to the existing sign pylon. Exhibits included photographs and drawings. She said the existing signage was approved by the Landmarks Preservation Board in 2000. On March 2, 2010 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for signage.

Applicant Comment:

Shawn Bowen, Tube Art, explained that the change was part of Washington Federal's rebranding. He said the wall sign would be new with a slight

change of color and would drop the word “Savings”. He said the pylon sign was existing and would be refurbished adding that the existing cabinet would be replaced with a new one, the pole would be painted and that the sign would be lower and smaller than the existing one. He explained the sign would be routed out pushed through letters and that only the letters will be illuminated. He confirmed that the pylon sign would remain in its existing location and they would reuse the existing pipe inside. Responding to board questions he said the existing material is a corrugated aluminum and the new pole cover would be a smoother aluminum and the cabinet on top will be aluminum with Plexiglas letters with on the letters being illuminated.

Ms. Wirsching noted that backlit signs do not comply with CCRC guidelines.

Ms. Wine clarified that currently both signs are backlit asked if both new signs would be as well.

Mr. Bowen said they would both be back lit but only the letters will be illuminated versus the old sign in which the entire green face was backlit.

Ms. Frestedt said the current sign pre-existed the adoption of the current Guidelines and the “backlit” issue did not come up as significant during CCRC review. She said that she considered it a like for like modification of existing and a minor modification which actually reduces the amount of illumination. She noted the building is non-contributing and the impact of the signage to the building may be viewed differently if in a different location. She said the CCRC had no discussion on the lighting type or about the pole cover.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said the Guidelines state that backlit signs are not allowed but noted she found the proposed backlit sign reasonable because it was an improvement over the existing sign.

Mr. Veith commented that it was a like for like change. He noted that the wall sign was less tall but wider and that the bottom surface didn’t go as well with the building but added that the building is non-significant. He said it is not a significant change to the neighborhood and that it was okay to approve.

Mr. Hannum agreed.

Mr. Abelsen said it was an unusual request but he agreed it was approximating replacement in-kind. He said the proposed cladding was an aesthetic update to the post support.

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

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the 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

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

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

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

031710.32 Columbia East/West Townhomes
3813-3823 and 3829-3831 S. Angeline St.
(Columbia City Landmark District)
Proposed guard rail/fencing

Ms. Frestedt explained the request for approval of fencing and fall protection on the site. Exhibits included a site plan, drawings, and photographs. She provided background information on the project and noted that she believed the current proposal provided adequate transparency on to the site. She said that the Final Design approval had been granted in 2008. She said that the proposal had been reviewed by the Columbia City Review Committee on March 2nd and the Architectural Review Committee on March 12th.

Applicant Comment:

Erich Armbruster, representing Ashworth Homes, explained that an inspector from the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) advised that the grade differential triggered the Code regarding fall protection. He went over the evolution of the design and other options - such as re-grading - that had been explored. He said the proposed 3" x 3" wire mesh fence at 3' high was from a design modified following meeting with the inspector and Ms. Frestedt. He said they responded to a request made at the ARC meeting for the posts to rise above the top rail and have a top cap and to ARC/CCRC comments about the vertical nature of the wire mesh being preferred. He said he discovered it would be possible to get 4" x 4" galvanized mesh, which he preferred.

Ms. Frestedt said the committees discussed the proposal to extend the fence into individual yards for division and that the members voiced no strong objection.

Mr. Hannum said at ARC he thought by vertically they meant stair stepping the fence sections.

Mr. Armbruster noted the code requirement is 36" high.

Mr. Veith asked if on the S. Angeline elevation the fence openings corresponded to the doorways of the building.

Mr. Armbruster explained that openings were not appropriate on the alley side due to the grade but that on the street side fence openings would correspond to door openings.

Mr. Abelsen noted that the trellis and gate dividing the two buildings was of a different design.

Mr. Armbruster said that they didn't have a strong desire to keep it and that if the board wanted it removed they wouldn't have a problem with that.

Ms. Frestedt said the gate – located between the two buildings - was part of the approval granted in 2008 and that the Board can't dictate removal but the applicant could recommend its removal.

Mr. Abelsen said the issue came up at the combined CCRC/ARC meeting that the material of the gate is not consistent with the fence material and consistency between the two was recommended.

Mr. Veith noted the openings left for the doorways in the fence on Angeline and asked if the fences that return back to the house are on either side of the walkway.

Mr. Armbruster said that was correct and that it was to provide enclosure for pets, kids etc. without having to provide a gate to the walkway. He said there are gates along the divider side of the fence.

Ms. Wine asked for clarification on the returns on the fences and asked the applicant to make a clarification on the drawing.

Mr. Armbruster said they follow the outboard posts.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Abelsen agreed with the need for clarification on the documents on two issues: 1) the elevations showing the location of the returns between the unit yards and 2) the design of the top rail, whether the slope would follow the sidewalk or should it be stair-stepped fashion.

Mr. Hannum said he wasn't concerned on the alley side but that on the street side he wanted consistency between the right and left sides.

Discussion about how to run the top rail on the fence – follow slope or stepped sections.

Ms. Wine said that running the wire mesh vertically was a large improvement.

Mr. Veith agreed and said that at ARC the fence was fine at the street. He said he had no issue with the fence at the alley side. He said if the return fences are there he wouldn't vote against but that he wouldn't like it if he lived there or as a passerby. He suggested the applicant submit a simple drawing to Staff showing actual fence line if they have returns.

Ms. Wirsching indicated that at ARC it was suggested that plantings would grow on the fence and added that the previously approved fence should be of the same material as the fences around the site.

Mr. Luoma appreciated the transparency and suggested plantings to soften the wire mesh.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for installation of a guard rail/fencing; applicant to provide a corrected site plan with accurate position of all fencing. This action is based on the following:

The proposed 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

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.

6. Landscaping. Landscaping is encouraged but not required. Approval of the use of landscaping, including window boxes and planters, shall be based on the applicant's desire and ability to maintain the landscaping.

7. Street Use. Any work that affects a street, alley, sidewalk, or other public right-of-way, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board. Emphasis shall be placed on creating and maintaining pedestrian-oriented public spaces and rights-of-way. The use of alleys for services and public-oriented activities shall be encouraged.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards

#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.

Ms. Wirsching made a friendly amendment that the Board recommend approval of an angled top rail to the fence on street side and recommends approval of the proposed 3" x 3" fence material or the 4" x 4" wire mesh as preferred by applicant.

Mr. Veith said the first amendment was unnecessary and accepted the second one.

Ms. Wine made a friendly amendment that the existing center fence materials match the proposed material.

Mr. Armbruster said they formally proposed to make the materials match and agreed to what was stated.

Ms. Frestedt asked if the board wanted the final drawing to be approved by CCRC or by the full landmarks board.

It was determined it would be reviewed by Staff.

Mr. Veith accepted the amendments.

MM/SC/TV/MS 8:0:0 Motion carried as amended.

031710.33 Josephinum/New Washington Hotel
1902 2nd Avenue

Ms. Chave introduced the application for proposed interior and exterior alterations. She said that the ARC reviewed this project on March 12.

Applicant Comment:

Stephen Lee, architect, introduced Father Paul Magnano, pastor of the church and Pete Mills, head of the liturgical design committee.

Father Magnano said the Archdiocese has owned the building since the 1950s. He explained the multiple uses of the building since that time. He said the former restaurant space has been a chapel and they intend to change it to a more beautiful space appropriate for liturgical celebration. They propose to renovate/restore the lobby which will be a shared space with residents and parishioners. He said the former Fare Start office would be future offices. He stated there is a need for a Catholic parish downtown for condo owners, apartment dwellers, street people, tourists, workers etc.

Mr. Lee explained the packet of drawings/photos which detailed the proposed work. He said the exterior of the building was designated and that some interior spaces were as well – the lobby and the dining/ballroom. He went over specifics of the designation in the dining/ballroom: the ceiling, the south, west and north walls; the east wall and anything below 8' were not designated.

Mr. Lee said that the building was home to 300 low income people and that the shared entrance was for the residents as well as parishioners of the church. He said the current entry – a store front entry system with airlock and reception desk – was not workable and would be replaced. He said that system would be removed and the existing reception desk replaced and the area will combine access supervision by both the parish and the apartment management. He said the lobby had been changed a lot over the years and

that only non-original fabric would be removed or changed. Two to three walls are proposed to be removed on the second floor to create a seating area for tenants. He said a new commercial kitchen necessitates the need to cut a hole in the roof for exhaust.

Mr. Lee presented the new entrance design noting the new doors, reception desk and new narthex as access to the church, vestibules, commercial kitchen and conference room. He said that originally the lobby went all the way back and he hopes they might discover more original marble floor. He said the lobby and church space currently have no ventilation or heat and that they plan to bring ducting through the basement.

Mr. Lee noted the ornate ceiling in the lobby and chapel space and said no work was planned for the lobby ceiling at this time. He said the skylight was Tiffany glass. He pointed out that the circles in the church space ceiling originally held 21 chandeliers and that they would replace the chandeliers in the original locations.

Mr. Lee explained the configuration of the reception desk and door system and said it would be more compatible to the building noting that the proposed reception desk will be round. He pointed out where the exhaust duct for the commercial kitchen would be on the 3rd floor roof – it will be 10' from the edge of the building and not visible from the street. He went over the new anodized aluminum doorways into the church with stained glass panels and the detail of the doorway. He said there would be a combination of leaded glass and laminated glass and noted the palette would be neutral – slightly transparent with some opaqueness. He said the narthex would serve as a buffer between the church and the lobby. He went over changes to the west side store front entry. He said that current doors are 7' high and new will be 9' high pointing out that the taller doors better fit the proportion of the building.

Mr. Lee said the windows in the ballroom were partly covered at one time with plaster and they will remove the covering and restore the windows back to the original configuration. He said the new chandeliers were more architecturally quiet than the original ones and provided cut sheets for review; the new chandeliers will provide less volume of light coming out of the fixtures so they won't be as bright.

Mr. Lee said they are opening up the back wall of the lobby to create access to a new conference room and a recess that goes back toward the kitchen. He explained drawing sheet # SD.6 – original look of space shown in SD.5 – he said there used to be three openings in the north wall; they will open the openings again and hope to find marble jambs. He said they propose to put in two small chapels. He said that page A4.6 shows the north side of the lobby and said an area with curtains and Plexiglas glazing between; they propose to

replace the curtains with a partition. He went over the entrance canopy detail and said they would make it more compatible to the building taking the lead from original photos where the face of the canopy was curved. He said they propose to use aluminum sheet sections at angles to recreate the curve at the front of the canopy and build two new light fixtures/boxes at the corners of canopy as existed in 1908. Referring to A3.1 he said they would be taking out existing plywood, glazing systems and would restore the wood windows – restoring them per Secretary of Interior Standards. They would re-glaze with ¼” laminated glass and won’t change the existing framework.

Mr. Lee went over details of windows to be restored noting proposed materials and colors. He went over the details of the new anodized aluminum storefront finish that would be dark bronze. He said that on the alley side they propose to remove five windows and reconstruct them to include louvers to use to bring in or exhaust air.

Ms. Wirsching noted that Alaska marble is not readily available and asked what would be proposed in its place.

Mr. Lee said they would introduce new black granite to match what is there. He said they would remove green marble wainscot and trim but would remove no Alaska marble. He said they propose to use a wood profile to match existing and have it faux painted and, noting A5.4, he said they would add new jambs going into the new chapel unless they find stone once then open up the wall. He explained that the opaque panels on A3.2A between the windows are currently dark brown and that they will be painted dark bronze like the window frames. He said that anything new they do with windows, canopy, and doors would use the same dark bronze color. He said they may come back with a mosaic idea for that wall. He said they are currently working on signage noting the difficulty separating the secular nature of the low income housing - which is funded by the City - from the church.

Responding to Board questions about the selection of the stained glass, Mr. Lee explained that the proposed glass is available locally and that a neutral color was selected because the interior decoration of the sacred space should be neutral. He said the glass is neutral and one can see through it close up but noted that it would add some separation between the lobby and the church spaces.

Mr. Abelsen noted there were some big blocks of Alaska marble in Tacoma but it was the white with black veining rather than what is needed here.

Mr. Lee said there are some slabs available to them through their contractor. He said the lobby floor might be a problem and noted it would be nice to fix it if they have the budget.

Mr. Abelsen commented that he was in favor of faux painted wood.

Mr. Lee explained that he had someone who was able to do it well and that it was not realistic to have marble made to that profile and stay within his budget. He said up close one can tell that it is wood but from a distance it isn't discernible.

Mr. Lee reiterated the possibility of a mural on the east wall in the future and noted that they were essentially creating a new parish from nothing.

Mr. Mills said that they valued preservation and noted the importance in valuing the built environment; he noted their commitment to the history of the building and that they cherished that history. He spoke to the importance of creating a space where rich and poor could mingle as equals in a space of worship and referenced the low income housing in the building.

Ms. Wine asked if the entry store front system profile would match the existing arch windows.

Mr. Lee said it would not – that they wanted it to be more interesting with more substance to it. He said the windows would be repainted the bronze color.

Responding to Board questions Mr. Lee explained that the south end of the reception desk drops down making it ADA accessible. He said that the chandeliers would be hung as the originals were – the bottom of the fixture would be lined up to the frieze.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, applauded the Archdiocese for its stewardship of the Josephinum. She said this was a great project and it was great to see how the space was being adapted. She asked Mr. Lee what color the ceiling would be painted.

Mr. Lee said that it would be painted a parchment white.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said it was a sensitive rehabilitation/renovation project and she appreciated the effort.

Mr. Veith said it was a thorough presentation, which he appreciated.

Mr. Abelsen said the presentation was well done.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior and interior alterations, per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior and interior changes do 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/MS/MH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

031710.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

031710.41 Harborview Medical Center—Center Wing of East Hospital
325 Ninth Avenue

Ms. Chave explained that Sarah Sodt, who was not in attendance at today's meeting, had prepared and negotiated the agreement. She said that Tom Walsh, attorney representing the owner, was available to answer questions.

Mr. Walsh said Ms. Sodt had written a good agreement, which his clients signed.

Board members had questions about the inclusion of the interiors.

Ms. Chave explained that just the entry lobby was designated and the designation report did not include detail on the floor.

Christine Keifer, Harborview Interim Director of Planning, explained that when the handicapped access ramp was put in much of the terrazzo floor was destroyed and is not repairable. She said the stairs in the multi-level lobby still have the original material which they will maintain.

Ms. Chave went over the administrative review language in the agreement pointing out that Board staff has the ability to grant an approval but has the ability to refer items to the full Board for review.

Action: I move that we approve the Controls and Incentives Agreement for Harborview Medical Center – Center Wing of East Hospital at 325 Ninth Avenue.

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

031710.42 Kenney Seaview Building
7125 Fauntleroy Way SW

Ms. Chave explained the owners' request for an extension to the second Board meeting of May 2010. She reported that the owners are applying for a contract rezone and that there are many steps to the process so it was unlikely they would be back before ARC before May.

Action: I move that we extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives at the Kenney Seaview Building, 7125 Fauntleroy Way SW, to the second Landmarks Preservation Board meeting in May 2010.

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

031710.5 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Chave reported that a number of nominations were coming up in the next few months.

031710.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator