



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 119/10

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, April 21, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

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

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Alyce Conti

Vice Chair Tom Veith called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

### **042110.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES** Meeting of April 7, 2010

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/JF/MS 10:0:0 Minutes approved as amended.

*Mr. Abelsen arrived at 3:34 p.m.*

**042110.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

042110.21 Columbia City Gallery  
4864 Rainier Ave. S.  
(Columbia City Landmark District)  
Proposed exterior alterations.

Ms. Frestedt went over the proposed installation of an aluminum-framed window on the north (alley) façade. Exhibits included plans, photographs and specification sheets. She reported that the Columbia City Gallery (formerly the Columbia Department Store) was built in 1910 and is a contributing building within the District. She said the LPB approved Certificates of Approval for signage and lighting on the Rainier façade in 2007 and 2008. SouthEast Effective Development (SEED) rehabilitated the building in 2004. She said that the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for the proposed exterior alteration.

Applicant Comment:

Architect Jim Rymysza explained the proposal to install an aluminum frame window on the north façade of the building. The existing small window had been filled in with plywood – they propose to open it up and widen the opening and install an aluminum window to match an adjacent window. The Milgard window will match the color, profile and trim of the adjacent window.

Ms. Frestedt pointed out the spec sheet in board packets.

Board Questions:

Mr. Rymysza, responding to board questions, explained that the existing small light will remain and the alley usage is office.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum explained that although aluminum windows are not preferred the Columbia City Landmark District, he thought it was better to match what existed than to introduce a new element. He said the committee thought the application was straightforward.

Mr. Veith noted that it had almost no discernible effect on the character of the district.

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

**2. Building Materials and Fixtures.** Integrity of the structure, form and decoration should be respected.

**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.

MM/SC/TV/CH 11:0:0 Motion carried.

042110.22

**The Shirley Marvin**

3815 S. Edmunds St.

(Columbia City Landmark District)

Proposed business identification signage.

Ms. Frestedt explained the request for approval of a MDO sign (dimensions: 42”w x 30”h) to hang from a wooden post installed in the yard. The sign will be illuminated by two small directional lights. Exhibits included a site plan, photographs and specification sheet. She said the Shirley Marvin Apartment building was constructed in 1935 and is a contributing building to the District. She said the LPB previously approved a Certificate of Approval for Preliminary Design of a new 3-story commercial building and 1-story class atrium to be constructed to the East of the extant building. Combined the new construction and extant building will operate as a hotel. The Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for the proposed signage.

Applicant Comment:

Rob Mohn said they won't break ground on the new building for a while and explained the intent to fix up the existing building and to install a sign for increased visibility for the business – an extended stay hotel. He described the simple sign – 4 x 4 post with pyramid cap all in matte black, with a hanging 50" long hanging blade sign bracket and 30" x 42" double sided sign.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum asked about the colors as rendered in the PhotoShopped image.

Mr. Mohn explained that the color samples distributed to the Board show the correct color.

Ms. Wirsching asked if there were other yard-type signs like this in the district.

Mr. Frestedt said there were a couple of examples in the District, but that they each have a different character to reflect the location. She added that this sign design was more appropriate for this location.

Mr. Mohn explained the sign would not be permanent and would only be up for about a year. He explained that once new building goes in he would return with a full sign proposal for the building.

Ms. Wine asked if the district has restrictions on sign size.

Ms. Frestedt said there were not but that signage must be compatible to existing signage in the district.

Mr. Wine asked about the use of LED lights.

Ms. Frestedt noted that it was subject to discretion of the board and that this was directional lighting.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum said that the CCRC said the sign would be a minor impact and was reversible and innocuous.

Ms. Wine expressed concern about the difference in light quality between incandescent and LED.

Ms. Wirsching noted that the Paramount sign had been redone using LED and that she could not perceive a difference between incandescent and LED. She said she was more concerned about the similarity between colors and less concerned with the use of LED.

Ms. Sodt explained that LED likely wasn't in common use when the Guidelines were written.

Mr. Veith noted that a different color rendered from LED wouldn't be critical here.

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. The sign colors will be actual colors rather than what is shown on the rendering.

**g. Sign Lighting.** Sign lighting should be subdued and incandescent. Back-lit signs are prohibited. Signs that flash, blink, vary in intensity, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion shall not be permitted.

## Secretary of the Interior's Standards

**#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/MH/SS 11:0:0 Motion carried.

042110.23 Dearborn House  
1117 Minor Avenue  
Proposed cornice restoration

Ms. Sodt explained that the ARC had reviewed the application twice and that the narrative description of the project had been sent to board members via email. She introduced Kji Kelly from Historic Seattle.

Kji Kelly explained the parapet restoration project and said they proposed to remove the surface rust and paint to get to a smooth surface. He said decorative elements would be constructed using sheet metal pieces hand formed to match existing; they will be zinc plated steel with attached with 3M adhesive and then applied with sealant. He said the rubber membrane patch would be removed and a piece of metal would be soldered in. He said the cornice would be painted one unified color as it originally had been.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen noted the good stewardship of the house and the great approach to this project.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed parapet repair.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed parapet repair does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. **122951** as the replacement decorative features of the parapet match the deteriorated or missing features in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities, as per Standard #6 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/JF/CH 11:0:0 Motion carried.

**042110.3 NOMINATIONS**

042110.31 Bloss House  
4055 SW Holgate St.

Mr. Abelsen noted that a number of letters and emails had been received supporting the nomination.

Eugenia Woo and Megan Meulemans representing Historic Seattle presented the nomination (full report in DON file) and noted the nomination had been a collective effort on behalf of the house's owner, Ruth Ward who has lived in the house since 1971, and Historic Seattle. Ms. Woo stated that she was impressed by the house's integrity and noted that Ms. Ward knew who the architect was and that she also had the architectural plans. She explained that she had received much information about architect/builder Elmer E. Green from Colin Barr who has done much research on him.

Ms. Meulemans provided historical background on West Seattle and the development of the Admiral neighborhood. She provided context of the site which is located in a predominantly single family neighborhood. She said the 1915 house has had only three owners, Roy and Mary Bloss, until 1926; Fred and Susan Copernoll, until 1971 and the current owner, Ruth Ward from 1971 to present.

Ms. Meulemans went over the history and details of the Craftsman Bungalow form and said the Bloss House fits the type and has a high degree of integrity. She noted the bungalow form as being a smaller, more affordable home built for "everyday people" living "everyday lives".

Ms. Woo pointed out the simple details that exemplify the style: notched bargeboards – one of Green's signatures; craftsman door and escutcheon, interior details of boxed ceilings, built-ins, fireplace, wainscot, and plate rail. She said the original kitchen cabinets are intact and pointed out a hidden ironing board. She said the kitchen floor and counter tops have been changed but everything else is intact. Ms. Woo pointed out the unpainted woodwork throughout. She noted the original clawfoot bathtub. She said Ms. Ward has the original drawings – which is rare – and the house appears to have been built as planned.

Ms. Woo explained that Mr. Green was a prolific designer/builder at the time. He had published a plan book in 1912 although this house design did not come from that. She reported that Elmer Green was self-taught and learned by being an apprentice, having started as a carpenter/builder, progressing on

to drafter and then, architect. She said the Bloss House was one of his last houses in the area as soon after he left for California. She said the Bloss House stands out because it is almost unaltered and because it is an excellent example of Green's work. She pointed out the twin gables and noted that this was a unique feature.

Board Questions:

Mr. Savage asked about other Seattle landmarks that were craftsman bungalows or that were designed by Elmer Green.

Ms. Chave said she didn't know of any other designated City of Seattle landmarks by Green but she noted the Ellsworth Storey houses in the Denny Blaine neighborhood which were of a higher style and not in this category. She also noted the Dr. James Washington House – a craftsman bungalow – which was designated because of the artist who owned it and not because of the architecture. She pointed out the high level of integrity of the Bloss House.

Mr. Veith pointed out the Carmack House and a couple groups of houses in the Central area that are designated landmarks but they were from a different period.

Ms. Sodt noted a small modest house in the Ballard neighborhood.

Mr. Finrow asked if there were other landmarks in the Bloss House neighborhood.

Mr. Woo said there were no houses in that area designated. She responded to other questions noting the owner would like to have the interior designated the as well as the exterior. She said that a second chimney shown on the drawings was not there and she didn't know if it had been removed or not built. She said the stairs and rails and metal corners on the stairs are all original. She said the criss-cross feature outside and the configuration of the steps are original. She said that the house is not high style nor was it meant to be and pointed out that a bungalow can be modest and still be outstanding. She said the nomination is tied to its integrity.

Ms. Chave cited Standard D, and read the wording of the standard.

Mr. Veith asked Ms. Woo to comment on Standard E.

Ms. Woo said that there are other outstanding examples of Green's work but pointed out that this house has a high degree of integrity.

Mr. Finrow noted that the key factor for him was that the interior was so intact and if that were removed the house would not be so outstanding; he called this a 'special circumstance'.

Ms. Woo said the nomination was for the interior and exterior. She said the house also exhibited a good example of the twin gables which set it apart from other houses. She reiterated that the materials used do exemplify the craftsman bungalow style.

Mr. Veith said that plan books were often advertisements for an architect and were a way to get another commission. He noted that in this case the client is named on the plans. He asked if this style was customary for Green.

Ms. Woo said that plan books were advertisements for more work, one could buy a plan and have changes made. She said Green's 1912 plan book contains Seattle and Victoria houses and noted that just a handful in Seattle were in the plan book.

Ms. Meulemans pointed out that no two Elmer Green houses were the same.

Mr. Veith asked about the interior wood work and if it was indeed mahogany as noted in the nomination.

Ms. Woo said it was not mahogany, and while she was unsure of the type, she said it had never been painted or stripped and still had its original finish. The front door has been refinished. She said the living room sconces, dining light and one of the bedroom lights are all original.

Public Comment:

Mollie Tremaine spoke in support of the nomination noting there were very few landmarked residences in West Seattle. She said the Bloss House is quintessential of Seattle houses of its period which allowed modest people to be homeowners. She said that many bungalows are at risk of demolition. She noted that this house has remained virtually unchanged since it was built in 1915. She pointed out that the retaining wall was a Seattle feature of the bungalow as was the full basement. She said this was a wonderful opportunity to nominate and consider the elements of the interior.

Sharon Price, neighbor and friend of the owner, supported nomination noting the quality of the intact original wood work which had not been painted. She noted the built-ins, boxed beam ceilings, original kitchen cabinets and the ironing board feature. She said there was a lot of community support for nomination.

Andrea Mercado, director of the Log House Museum, spoke in support of the nomination. She said it is a modest craftsman house and noted the tendency to focus on the big, fancy houses. She said that one cannot miss houses like the Hainsworth House but that one could drive right by the Bloss House because it doesn't catch the eye like the Hainsworth or early suburban mansions. She noted that there is significant architecture but much has been changed and that this house has survived trends of avocado, orange shag carpet, gray and mauve of the 1980s and granite. She said when you walk in, you stop and note "this is what it was like in 1915" and said that in 1915 this house looked almost exactly like this which is something to recognize in the history of Seattle because we're changing a lot we are losing what we were. She said this is a working class house and we talk a lot about the people with the money and who changed and built Seattle as we know it. She said that these are the people who worked for those people – they may not have been visible and unheard of but vital to the history of Seattle. She asked the Board to support nomination.

Kirk Meyers said he owns four houses in the neighborhood and spoke to the intactness and authenticity of the Bloss House. He said his houses at one time were very grand houses and all of that has been wiped away. He reported that the fireplace doors were built by a well-known copper artist who died in the 1980s and had work in the Bellevue Art Museum. He said that this house still has the coal easement at the back of the house where coal carts delivered coal to the houses. He said the space works as it is, which is why it wasn't remodeled and the house stands the test of time.

Rick Sever, Historic Seattle, said he is an architectural historian and general contractor working on residential projects in this area for the last thirty years. He noted the bargeboards were a unique feature particularly when joined as in the Bloss House. He said the head casing over the dining room buffet is monumental. He said he has never seen another ironing board like in this house even though he has been doing a research project on millwork in Seattle from 1890 to the 1950s. He said he supported nomination and designation of this house and asked the board to support as well. He said he has wondered when the Wallingford Bungalow going to be nominated.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Savage said he was familiar with the house and that while it didn't "jump out" at him it was a good example of a bungalow. He said he didn't think it was outstanding but that he said it fits Standard D better if the house as a whole (interior and exterior) was included.

Ms. Howard thanked the owner and her helpers for nominating the house and said it was exciting to see a modest house preserved.

Ms. Wirsching said it is a common house but it is intact. She said that Standard D fits if the interior were included. She expressed concern about the ramifications of designating the interior.

Mr. Hannum recommended nominating the entire interior and then narrow it down for designation. He said too often landmarks are big grandiose houses and it is nice to see a nomination for a small scale house. He said the detailing makes it unique and noted the overwhelming community feedback.

Mr. Luoma noted the high level of integrity and supported nomination. He said it is rare to see such integrity. He supported nomination because of the house's ability to express the visible character of the Craftsman style. He said it is unique and not "cookie-cuttered". He expressed a desire for a tour of the house.

Ms. Strong supported nomination saying it was a common house but noted the level of detail.

Mr. Finrow recommended including the interior and said as package it is an outstanding example.

Mr. Veith said the house uses standard bungalow typology of living room, dining room all on one side and bedrooms on the other. He said there is no entry alcove and that the entry is directly into the living room. He said the designer rethought the typology and may have done that for his clients. He noted the typical exterior detailing and said the house would be better in a district or in a group as it is not outstanding. He said the interior helps make the case for nomination, which he supported.

Ms. Wine supported nomination based on D noting the unique features and recommended including the interiors.

Mr. King agreed with Ms. Wine and supported nomination based on Standard D noting the integrity. He said it is a great house.

Mr. Abelsen said the Craftsman is significant to Seattle. He said he supported nomination but not sure that Criterion E should be pursued. He supported including the interior. He noted that it had been maintained for almost 100 years and the hand that designed and crafted it is still visible.

Action: I move approval of the Bloss House at 4055 SW Holgate St. for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site, the exterior and interior of the building ; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for June 2,

2010; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/TV/CH 11:0:0 Motion carried.

**042110.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

042110.41 George Washington Carmack House  
1522 E. Jefferson Street

Ms. Sodt presented the owner's request for an extension.

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

MM/SC/TV/JF 11:0:0 Motion carried.

**042110.5 BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Chave reminded Board members to vote in the Partners in Preservation opportunity.

Ms. Chave encouraged students in the audience to apply for the Get Engaged position noting it was a one-year commitment for those 29 and under.

Ms. Wirsching asked that in Staff Report motions the property name and address be included.

**042110.6 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator