



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 246/10

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, July 7, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

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

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Jerry Finrow

Chair Vernon Abelsen called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

#### **070710.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

June 2, 2010

MM/SC/TV/MH 7:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Ms. Wine abstained.

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"

**070710.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

070710.21 Weed Building  
4906-4908 Rainier Ave. S.  
(Columbia City Landmark District)  
Proposed exterior alterations and paint colors.

Rebecca Frestedt went over the proposed exterior alterations, including: paint colors; window restoration and replacement; installation of lighting fixtures; new cladding on the east and north facades; removal of two chimneys, and construction of a one-story addition (88 sq. ft.) on the east façade. Exhibits included photographs, plans and specification sheets. She provided background information noting that the Weed Building was constructed in 1909, designed by J.L. McCauley and is a contributing building within the District. The stucco finish and brick piers were part of a 1929 alteration. Additional storefront alterations occurred in the 1930s.

Ms. Frestedt said the Columbia City Review Committee received a project briefing on April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2010 and members of the CCRC conducted a site visit on April 19<sup>th</sup>. The CCRC reviewed the proposal for exterior alterations and paint colors on June 4<sup>th</sup> and made recommendations about the project, including the request for an alternate color scheme, that have been incorporated to the final proposal.

Larry Johnson and Ellen Mirro from the Johnson Partnership presented the application. Mr. Johnson noted the northern most entry of the building was added in 1930 at which time the window configuration changed. He said they propose to restore the second story windows back to the 1930 appearance.

Ms. Mirro went over the color schemes – a preferred scheme and one alternate – and noted they preferred scheme was chosen because it will work with the existing brick and tiles.

Mr. Johnson added that through paint sampling they had determined that the body of the building was originally off-white.

Ms. Mirro went over proposed changes to the east façade and noted they propose to remove two chimneys because they are in a state of disrepair and said that an engineer’s survey report was included in board member packets. She explained that a deck addition was also proposed for the east facade and that they would move a non-original door to the center of the rear of the building for better access; lighting would be added at the door. Proposed siding will be smooth Hardi-Panel with a 5” exposure.

Ms. Wirsching asked what the chimneys were serving and Ms. Mirro responded that they weren’t serving anything.

Ms. Frestedt reported that textured Hardi-Panel had been installed on the north exposure without Board approval; it replaced asphalt shingles.

Ms. Mirro said that on the west façade they propose to repair the gutter that is underneath the canopy. A light fixture is proposed for the alcove. She referenced a photo of the windows on the second story. She said that there are two existing original windows; the arched one will be retained and the rest of the windows will be replaced with Chosen windows with leading applied to the glazing by a separate glazier.

*Mr. King arrived at 3:42 p.m.*

Mr. Abelsen asked about the anchor motif in the photo and how it would be painted.

Mr. Johnson said it is a “W” for “Weed”. Ms. Mirro said it will be painted the same color as the lettering on the parapet.

Responding to board comments and questions about the proposed use of Hardi-Panel, Ms. Frestedt went over the guidelines for new construction noting that the smooth finish is preferred. She explained that the CCRC was willing to accept this because it was on a secondary façade upper elevation and referred to other locations where the material had been approved. She said that the material would not receive staff support if it was proposed for a primary façade.

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Johnson noted that the deck railing on the east elevation was incorrectly shown as 3’0” high and it should be 42” high. He said that stucco will be repaired as necessary.

Mr. Strong asked if they would eventually be getting rid of the fluorescent lighting.

Ms. Mirro said new fixtures are being added to the east façade door and an alcove on the west façade and they are just repairing the under canopy lighting; other lighting will be addressed on a future application. Ms. Frestedt added that the fluorescent fixtures could be removed, but any new fixtures would be subject to Board approval.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Johnson said he wasn’t sure if the green tile is Batchelder or Malibu and noted it dates back to the 1930 alterations. He said he would propose to patch with epoxy or replace broken pieces. He commented that the owner was looking into grants to help with repairs and tile restoration.

Mr. Savage disagreed with the engineer's report that recommended removal of the chimneys. He said that "lesser is better" in terms of removal. He said that it is possible to attach them to the building. He said there is nothing in the code that says it has to be taken down. He recommended leaving the chimneys and attaching them to the building.

Mr. Abelsen said the CCRC did not object to the addition.

Mr. Veith said he was not concerned about the back of the building noting it was difficult to see from the right of way. He said the change wouldn't affect the character of the district.

Ms. Wirsching said the chimneys are not character defining elements and pointed out that a portion of the addition will cover the chimney.

Mr. Hannum confirmed that he had no problem with chimney removal. He said he was disappointed in the change of siding on the side of the building but noted it was on a non-primary façade and that it had been approved on a case by case basis. He said the colors are an improvement over what had originally been proposed. He explained that where Hardi-Panel had been approved it replaced non-original materials and was on a non-primary façade.

Ms. Wine expressed concern about the integrity of the building from all surfaces noting that pedestrians do perceive the change in materials. She said that the chimneys are character defining pieces of a non-primary façade.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the Design Guidelines state that synthetic materials and faux wood grain are discouraged not prohibited. She reiterated that the material had been approved in other instances in the district.

Mr. Veith commented on the proposed changes to the rear façade noting they would not make a big difference in how one perceives this building; he said he was okay with the back of the building. He said the faux leading on the front windows would be applied rather than internal but would leave a shadow line.

Ms. Howard said she preferred the applicant's preferred option color palette noting it will give a nice dignity to the building.

Ms. Wirsching said the preferred option colors make sense and are consistent with the character of the building. She said she preferred the dark blue from Option 2 over the green in the preferred option.

Mr. Veith said he preferred the preferred option and said the green paint – selected to match the tile - works better with the brick.

Mr. Abelsen agreed that the Hardi-Panel on the north façade be painted to match the other elevations. He noted his preference for the chimneys to stay.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations and paint colors for the Weed Building, located at 4906-08 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

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

**Relevant Code citations**

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

**Relevant Columbia City Landmark District Design Guidelines**  
**Guidelines/Specific**

**2. Building Materials and Fixtures.** Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

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

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

**4. Storefront.** Building facades should have a greater proportion of window and door openings than wall spaces on pedestrian levels. Any exterior façade alteration shall respect the original architectural integrity of the storefront. Original fenestration shall be preserved (i.e., windows, transom areas, and door design). Storefront materials should be brick, wood, concrete, and tile, or a combination thereof.

**12. Additions to Existing Buildings**

- a. All new additions, penthouses, and building systems equipment 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.

b. Although additions to historic buildings are not discouraged, they should be located to maintain the integrity of the primary facade. Additions shall not be attached to the primary façade.

c. Building additions should be compatible with the massing, scale, form, fenestration and materials of the original building. However, an addition should be designed to be recognized as a product of its own time and should be distinguishable from the historic building.

**Secretary of the Interior’s Standards**

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

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

**#5.** Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

**#6.** Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

**#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/TV/MS      10:0:0 Motion carried.

070710.22

Fremont Library

1731 N. 35<sup>th</sup> St.

Proposed door replacement

Ms. Chave said the application was reviewed at ARC and that the applicants would respond to ARC concerns.

Morgan Elliott, Miller Hayashi, explained that the ARC had requested more historical information on the doors. He said the application proposes to replace three sets of doors: the main entry doors (preserving existing frame), the meeting room west doors (preserving existing frame) and the south entry doors (replace door and frame). He said the main entrance doors appear to be original and are oak veneer, single glazed with inset grille work that is original. He pointed out that a cast iron mail slot had been removed and kick plates added. He said a translucent stain was added. He said they propose to replace the doors in kind – single glazing, reuse existing grilles and hardware. He explained the damaged condition of the doors.

Mr. Elliott went on to describe the proposed changes to the west meeting room doors commenting that the design is similar to the front doors but with different grilles and bottom designs. He said the fir door has had much wear and pieces are separating. He said the new doors will be fir, with double glazing, grilles onto surface and is in line with the original design. He said they propose to use opaque paint the doors to match the exterior rafters.

Mr. Elliott explained that the SW entrance door of the meeting room had been installed in the 1980's and was not historically significant. He explained that it received the worst weathering and said they would replace with an aluminum clad door and frame. He said for security reasons they would use an opaque panel with no grille work.

Glenn Osaka, Capital Projects Manager, Seattle Public Library, said if the doors could have been replaced they would have been and he went over the difficulties involved in repair work in the branch. He said they are trying to take advantage of furloughs in doing work so they won't have to worry about an extra closing. Aside from the substantial logistics involved he said the doors are beyond repair.

Mr. Elliott explained he would do an accurate recreation of the doors.

Ms. Chave said the applicant responded to ARC concerns in an e mail and that response had been emailed to the Board last week.

There was discussion about the proportion of the kick plates and board members generally agreed that the kick plate should be lower. Mr. Elliott said that the existing kick plates were higher to cover where the removed mail slot had been.

Mr. Osaka said it would be no problem to lower the kick plate and noted that it is needed to protect the door.

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Osaka said just the meeting room doors would get the opaque enamel.

Public Comment:

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, commented that it was good to see the doors being fixed.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said the front doors are character-defining elements and it is important to give as close a sense to the original doors as possible. She commented on the importance of bringing the kick plates down and bringing back recessed panels as had originally been there. She said there was more flexibility with the meeting room doors noting they had never been built as originally designed. She was pleased to see the single glazing and the inset grilles at the main entry - it will help to better define the doors in a way that makes it more consistent with the original doors there.

Ms. Howard mentioned that she liked that the grilles on the meeting room doors is being brought closer to what the original drawings look like.

Ms. Strong said she was not a proponent of the opaque paint but noted that the west door was not original.

Mr. Osaka explained the difficulty in maintaining varnished wood. He said the west doors open onto a City park and these doors take a lot of abuse; he said the painted finish is easier to maintain. He said that because it faces due west it deteriorates faster.

Mr. Abelsen said there really wasn't a significant difference in the durability of paint over varnish and noted that given the activities at the park near that door upkeep might be more of a problem; he advised the Board could recommended the opaque finish.

Mr. Veith said he was okay with the clad door at south entry and painting it to match the external timbers would be acceptable. He said he would like to see the clear oak with the panels at the front entry and at the west door he would prefer a clear finish and a door with a panel but he would be willing to accept something as described in the application because the originally designed doors were never installed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed door replacement at the Fremont Library at 731 N. 35<sup>th</sup> St., as per the submittal; the main entry doors are to be replaced with an oak veneer door to be clear finished, with single glazing and the inset grilles; the west facing meeting room doors are to be replaced with a wood door that is to received an epoxy/enamel finish; and the south door is to be replaced with a solid metal clad door with no glazing, to have a finish to match the west door; the kick plates at the main entry door to be below an inset panel; and kick plates

on the west facing doors are recommended for approval as submitted. This action is based on the following:

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

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

Ms. Chave requested the applicant forward revised drawings to her.

### **070710.3 NOMINATIONS**

#### **070710.31 Admiral's House 2001 W. Garfield St.**

Michael Nanney, Forest City, explained that the house is already a community landmark. He said that the Navy owns the land and the house is owned by Forest City. He said the land will be fee transferred to Forest City and then the property and house will be sold.

Mimi Sheridan, Architectural Historian, provided context of the site and said the legal property description is a lengthy one. She said the Navy's history in the Puget Sound area goes back to 1841 and she said that Sand Point was developed in the 1920s and 1930s. She said the Naval Supply Station was established in 1940. She said the area was comprised of warehouses, navy buildings and a brig.

She said the house was built in 1944 in the Colonial Revival style. She said it is wood frame construction and was made from what wood was available using wall board rather than the labor intensive lath and plaster. She pointed out the stucco cladding. She said there have been minimal alterations to the house but she noted the many landslides on the site – the last one in 1999. She said that with the exception of one, all the original wood sash windows are there. She pointed out the shed roof dormer, the service entrances and the garden on the west side.

Ms. Sheridan went over the features of the Colonial Revival style: symmetrical façade, rectilinear plan with shed dormer, center entry vestibule with pilasters, and 8/8 windows with shutters. She pointed out the center hallway, strict division between service and entertainment areas and said the house was built for entertaining. She pointed out a second formal entry at the back of the house. She said the house has been vacant since 2006.

Ms. Sheridan went through photos of the house pointing out the sunrooms – a large one taking up the entire west end of the house and a smaller one on the east end. She noted the deck off the master bedroom and the abundance of built-ins. She reported that the kitchen was remodeled in the 70s. She said the tile in the upstairs bathrooms was original. She said the third floor has a small bedroom, two bathrooms and two large rooms that were likely shared by servants.

Ms. Sheridan said architect Roger Gotteland trained at L'Ecole des Beaux Arts and the University of Washington. She said he worked with Paul Thiry and Shea and also partnered with Roy Koczarski. She said he was best known for his churches.

She noted the house's strong connection to the Navy and that it is one of the few remaining WWII military buildings in Seattle. She said the house is an excellent example of the Colonial Revival Style and also noted its prominent location.

Mr. Abelsen said his firm at one time did a survey of the site but that there was currently no affiliation. He asked about the position of the Admiral.

Ms. Sheridan said the Admiral was responsible for overseeing the 13<sup>th</sup> District, Supply Base, Sandpoint and Whidbey.

Mr. Nanney said that for a time this Admiral was the commanding officer of Naval Base Seattle but noted the changing role of Admiral and of the location of the Admiral Quarters to Bremerton. He said that there were four admirals in the Puget Sound region.

Ms. Strong asked if any famous people were associated with the house.

Ms. Sheridan said she will bring more information to the designation meeting.

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Sheridan explained that there are other examples of Colonial Revival Style in Seattle but that it was not common at the time it was built in 1944. She said that she was not able to determine who dictated in what style the house would be built but that it was appropriate style. She said that the style seems to be a common one for Admiral housing. She said that several heads of state had been entertained there and the (former)

mayor(s) has entertained at the house. She pointed out that the house is visible from the marina, park, cruise ships and from the water.

Mr. Veith asked about access to the driveway.

Ms. Sheridan explained that the looped driveway is accessed from under the Magnolia Bridge.

Mr. Veith said the country house scheme doesn't work right here. The main entry would be at the back of the house and one would go through the house to get to the garden. He asked about the stairway.

Ms. Sheridan said that the stairs are narrow compared to a grand stairway but that it is minimally grand enough. She said that the Fort Lawton houses were grander.

Mr. Veith said the stair was narrow (as would befit a ship's ladder), however, as for the house - to quote an Admiral in a Jane Austen novel - "it's bigger than a frigate".

Mr. Luoma asked if the slopes were in danger to slide again.

Mr. Nanney said that they are and commented that every tree on the south Magnolia bluff has a bend to it; he said the area is all fill. He said that a sewer replacement project will be starting and they will take geo tech borings to get more information about the subsurface conditions. He said the Navy calls this house Quarters A and that there had been a Quarters B; the last slide took out Quarters B.

Public Comment:

Leanne Olson, Queen Anne Historical Society, spoke in support of nomination and said the best view of the house is from the west slope of Queen Anne. She suggested that in the covenants there should be a requirement that the American flag be flown there.

Char Eggleston, Queen Anne Historical Society, said the house is a great piece of history and that Seattle was a big part of WWII. She noted the great and prominent location. She said the building, site, garage should all be nominated and designated and suggested C, D, and F.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, spoke in support of nomination and said that she toured the property which she called "amazing". She said they are working to get a preservation easement on the property. She said this house is atypical of the architect's work and that the Navy must have wanted Colonial Revival style.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said the history was exciting and that she agreed with the Staff Report. She noted that the Sand Point Naval Base is now on the National Register.

Ms. Strong said the design speaks to the time and a way of life. She supported nominating the interior public space.

Mr. Abelsen supported nomination noting that the house is worthy of landmark status and said that more criteria may apply.

Mr. Luoma noted the prominence from the west slope of Queen Anne and noted its figurative relationship of the Admiral.

Mr. Veith said the shutters have been changed to a different size and now look like “pretend” shutters and that there is a different railing atop the west end sunroom. He said the house is well worth nominating mainly due to its association and its prominence. He said that while it does embody the characteristics of the style it is not an excellent example of the style.

Action: I move approval of the Admiral’s House at 2001 W. Garfield 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 exterior of the building, the main floor public rooms, and the site, including the garage; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for August 18, 2010; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

**070710.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Chave explained that she was working on scheduling two tours, one for the Admiral’s House and one for Pacific Science Center.

**070710.5 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator