



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 359/10

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, September 1, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sadt
Rebecca Frestedt
Karen Gordon
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Patrick King
Mark Hannum

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

090110.1 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

090110.11 3834 S. Edmunds St.
(Columbia City Landmark District)
Proposed final design for new construction of a three-unit townhome development.

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"

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed Final Design of an attached three-unit townhome to be constructed on the lot behind the extant residence. She said that the project received Preliminary Design approval on July 15, 2009. The extant home (Lincoln-Rotermund House) was built in 1920 and is a contributing home within the District. She noted that the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of Final Design for new construction on August 3rd, as proposed.

Dave Biddle, Elemental Design, said that there have been no changes to the massing or the location of the windows as approved by the Board in July 2009. He reported that they had submitted to the Dept. of Planning and Development for building permits and have received zoning and structural approval. He went over materials and finishes – combination brick will be used as accent on the volumes. Brick was selected to match the building across the street. Cladding will fiber cement Hardi-panel in light and dark gray. Color will be consistent with what has already been approved for upgrade of the existing home. He said the windows will be dark aluminum, dark bronze. He said the landscape fences will be stained wood with wire mesh to allow for plantings to be used as screening. The fences will match what was approved across the alley.

Ms. Howard arrived at 3:40 p.m.

Responding to a request to show what had been approved in the preliminary design approval Mr. Biddle went through the boards and provided neighborhood context, including images of the adjacent building, site plan, landscape plan and the front and side facades to show massing. Plantings were selected based on the scale of development and what already exists in the neighborhood.

Board Questions:

Responding to Board questions Mr. Biddle pointed out the new fence locations on the site plan. He explained that there is no room for plantings at the rear parking spaces.

Responding to comments Ms. Frestedt noted that some the changes to the window trim and front porch of the existing home were not consistent with what the Board approved during renovation; these changes are not compliant and will come back to the local committee. She explained that the application under review today was only for Final Design of the three townhomes.

Ms. Wine questioned the use of the Hardi-plank and larger scale materials and wondered how it fit in with the Guidelines.

Mr. Biddle said the use of Hardi-plank was partly a design decision. He said that they used brick to tie into the neighborhood and want the building to sit as a background for the existing home. He said smaller materials would have made it too busy. Hardi is similar in design to stucco.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

A mistake on the drawings was noted – windows are noted to be vinyl on the drawings but they will be aluminum dark bronze anodized windows. A request was made for submission of corrected drawings.

Mr. Veith commented that the new buildings should look new yet should pick up on the scale, pattern and massing of the old. He said that it would be nice if the penthouse was lower or gone but noted this had already been approved. He said he had no major issues.

Mr. Abelsen noted that the penthouse heights were reduced in scale as part of the Preliminary Design approval.

Mr. Savage noted that the Hardi-panels are shown broken into segments and asked the applicant to show how the panels will be jointed.

Ms. Wine had questions about how they came up with the window openings. Ms. Frestedt reminded Board members that the bulk, massing and scale had already been approved. She said that the Board was reviewing finishes, landscaping and materials for the townhouses. She noted that because of their location behind the extant house the CCRC was open to accepting some design elements they wouldn't have approved elsewhere.

Mr. Finrow noted the location of the building on the site and cited the aerial photo which showed a very diverse area with lots of variety in buildings in massing and character. He said that within this context the building fits in well and said he supported the design.

Mr. Abelsen expressed concern about the newer materials coming into the district but noted this was a back-drop building and the priority is to focus on the 1920s building and give emphasis to that. He noted the compromise in allowing the fiber cement board and said the building will be distinctly new in design and finishes.

Ms. Wirsching said the building won't be particularly visible and that she was not too concerned about the materials.

Ms. Chave noted that the window schedule needs to be corrected and reminded the applicant to submit it.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Final Design at 3834 S. Edmunds St. and that the window schedule be corrected to reflect the proposed aluminum windows. This action is based on the following:

The proposed final design meets 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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

13. New Construction

d. Facade Composition. Use a solid-to-void ratio, or window-to-wall ratio, that is similar to that which is found on historic buildings within the block and throughout the District. Façade design must provide visual interest (depth and relief) and avoid large unbroken surface areas.

ii. Residential

A. Windows and Doors

1. The relationship of width to height of windows and doors and their placement on the façade should reflect the same relationship found on other residential historic buildings within the District.
2. Window and door casing and trim should be designed with depth and visual relief.

e. Materials, Colors and Finishes. Materials commonly used on historic buildings in the District are preferred. Colors should be subdued and consistent with the historic buildings within the District.

ii. Residential

A. Building facades should be clad in stucco, brick, or wood clapboard, shiplap or shingle siding, or a combination thereof. Synthetic materials and faux wood graining are discouraged.

B. Wood and metal-clad windows are preferred. Vinyl windows are discouraged.

Secretary of the Interiors 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.

MM/SC/JF/CH 8:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Wine opposed.

090110.12

Naval Reserve Armory
860 Terry Avenue North

Ms. Wirsching and Mr. Savage recused themselves.

Sam Miller, LMN, introduced lighting designer Shannon Glover, and explained that the building has not been lit in the past. He noted their intention to do something subtle and explained that they propose to put lighting within the seven bays to light them up and to accentuate their strong rhythm. He pointed out other proposed areas to receive new lighting: the medallions at the entry, soft lighting at the corner, the top will be bathed in light to read the form, and the high roof will be edged in a blue light reflective of MOHAI and Naval Reserve colors. He provided photo mock ups showing the proposed lighting and went over the lighting plan. He said they will use LEDs recessed into the window sills with a glazed surface over the opening; they will cut into the concrete to embed the LED element and noted that it is reversible as it can be patched and it is paintable. He said there will be small recessed fixtures at the roof terrace installed at the back of the parapet. He explained that the strip LED on the high roof will be installed on the back of the parapet and noted the fixture will not be visible from the ground. He went over the different options to create an even glow and noted that the 2' fluorescent does it well. He explained that they will do a design-build for the terrace lighting and will come back for review/approval of that; he commented that they want to do twinkle-lights to add life to the terrace at night.

Mr. Miller went over interior lighting and said they will remove the existing 1980s fluorescents and propose pendant lights in the main lobby. He provided two options and noted their preference for Option 2. He said they propose 6" diameter recessed cans in the stairwell calling it the "least obtrusive" option.

Mr. Miller explained that the periscope with a camera attached to it would be put on Level 4 – the Bridge space – and would go up through the high roof. He said they will need to provide support for the floor above and the Level 3 roof. He said it has to be sited off center and noted it will have a 360° view. He provided photos so Board members will have the context of its proposed location. He said there would be a collar at the high roof, on Level 4 floor, minimal structure, and 2" deep tubes at the underside of the concrete slab with plate bolts through the concrete slab, and roof flashing - none of which would be visible from the ground.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the structure under the periscope would be visible. Mr. Miller said it would but would be painted steel to match.

Mr. Finrow asked about the lighting at the lower part of the building's corners.

Mr. Miller explained the intent to define the edges of the volume.

Mr. Finrow said that it looks better in the upper portion and recommended shielding the light there a bit to cast a narrower band and to shade so the light focuses more precisely rather than bleed into the next bay.

Responding to Board questions Mr. Miller explained that the periscope would be fixed and that there would be no shadows of the periscope because of its location on the north side of the building. He said there would be no lighting except for the red flashing lights which are already on it.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Abelsen commented on the good ARC process with this application. He commented that he agreed with Mr. Finrow on the corner lighting.

Mr. Luoma noted that the motion should state that all preferred lighting options were acceptable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior and interior lighting with the stipulation that the owner's preferred option be used in each case and that the corner lighting be more tightly focused on the corners, and the proposed installation of a periscope on the Naval Reserve Armory at 860 Terry Avenue North, per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior and interior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Designation Report 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/TV/CH 7:0:2 Motion carried. Ms. Wirsching and Mr. Savage recused themselves.

090110.13

St. Nicholas Building

1501 10th Ave. E.

Proposed new paving and landscaping for playground area

Ms. Wirsching recused herself.

Ms. Chave explained that the exterior of the building and the site are included in the Ordinance. She pointed out the existence of a lot of temporary structures that aren't reviewed by the Board. She noted the playground is on the west side of the building.

Applicant Brenda Barnes showed photos providing context of the work; she pointed out the asphalt areas. She said the parking lot will be smaller; it will be repaved and they will create an area on the side for landscaping and a play area.

Alan Ward, landscape architect, said that the church has done resurfacing on the parking lot and noted the church houses one of the largest Waldorf Schools in the area. He explained the intent to turn the parking lot into a softscape. He said that the asphalt is being removed around the perimeter and they will bring in a variety of reliable, low maintenance plants that won't get too tall and will provide seasonal changes as well as some active edibles. He said they will pave with a modular precast paver in an area for outdoor classes or for reflection. He explained that the community is involved in the process and will do a lot of the build-out. He said parents and the community will bring in some materials, and some fruit trees and noted there will be a rain garden. He said the intent is to keep all the plantings at 6' – 8' in height and noted that trees can actively be fruiting at a small size. He said that

he didn't see fruit dropping and creating a mess as a problem noting they would be located away from the parking lot. He didn't see the fruit trees as a bee attractant as a problem.

Responding to board questions he explained that the small structures were used by the students and the site also hosts medieval games.

Ms. Chave reminded the Board that these structures are all temporary structures.

Ms. Barnes said the structures are mostly open structures and she said they share the buildings with the Gage School. She explained that the school and volunteers will be responsible for maintenance.

Mr. Ward said that even dwarf species can get really tall if left uncared for. He said they have no plans for larger trees given the view and also the potential for damage to the asphalt by shallow roots.

Ms. Barnes said that there are some existing large trees around. She explained that the area has been asphalted since the 1940s – 1950s. She went on to explain that play equipment specified for the playground is of natural materials – logs – and is not part of this proposal.

Responding to Board comments Mr. Ward said that the landscape plan is very detailed to provide an integrated whole – especially when the community is involved in planting. He said the materials will work throughout the year and it also helps to keep the costs specific. He said the funds to pay for the work are raised by an auction.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith disclosed that his niece had attended this school.

Mr. Luoma said the planting design is nice and noted the appropriate variety of plantings and natural amenities. He said it is a good educational opportunity for kids.

Mr. Veith said that it appears that the asphalt has been there for a long time and said that the character of the plantings will be helpful to the character of the place and will make it more like the character of the front.

Ms. Howard said it will improve the visitor's experience of the character of the place.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed new paving and landscaping for the playground area, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

3. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 111881 as the proposed site alterations do 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*.

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

MM/SC/MS/AL 8:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Wirsching recused herself.

090110.14

Fire Station #13

3601 Beacon Ave .S.

Proposed renovation and addition, including replacement of apparatus bay doors, emergency generator

Ms. Chave reported that ARC had seen the project many times.

Project architect Will Scales explained that the building was built in 1928; it is a single story concrete building with a prototypical floor plan. He noted that it had been renovated in the 1980s which included an addition. He explained the need for seismic upgrade and improved emergency power supply and communications system and that the apparatus trucks are larger now. He commented that this project will optimize the functionality of the fire station. He reported that the beanery will be relocated into the new addition and its former location will be used for storage.

Mr. Scales went over exterior changes and explained that an addition would be added on the back side of the building and they will add a wall at the berm to create outdoor patio for barbeque and an alcove for the new emergency generator. He said that the addition will be a medium brown stucco finish and that on the south side of the existing addition they will pull off the EFIS finish and replace it with plywood sheathing to improve structural strength. To accommodate the larger trucks he said they will remove the concrete column between the bays and replace the doors.

Mr. Scales explained they will replace the cherry tree and add an 18" tall wall on the front and that no signage or lighting is proposed for it. He said that a tent is up temporarily during construction to house the fire trucks and that the station will be in operation during the project. The existing flagpole and memorial will be removed temporarily during construction and will be returned when construction is finished.

Ms. Chave explained that the exact construction detail for the doors will not be provided until the applicants have a manufacturer. She explained what is designated and noted that the entire site had been included in the designation.

Mr. Scales said that a memorial would be performed by the fire department on removal of the memorial; he said he didn't know the details of the ceremony but assured Board members that it would be well-protected during construction.

Responding to Board member questions Mr. Scales explained that the new windows will have a similar profile to existing windows which were installed in the 1980s and they will match as closely as possible. He explained that the original doors were two barn-like doors and went on to describe the proposed new doors. He described the grid pattern and glazing pattern on the overhead doors. He noted they worked with

ARC to come up with the grid pattern on the doors and the vertical orientation of the windows.

Mr. Abelsen commented that the vertical elements work, citing the metal plates with the reveal that will create a shadow line.

Mr. Finrow asked about proposed fencing.

Mr. Scales pointed out the 4' berm upon which a 3 ½' high wall will be placed with 2 – 3' of black chain link fence on top for security purposes; this will create a patio area. He said that bushes on the park side of the fence will create a green buffer. Black was chosen for the chain link so it will not stand out.

Public Comment:

Mark Holland, community member, commented that he doesn't like the black chain link and that SPU was putting up a lot of fences with barbed wire.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said the work requires the temporary removal of a monument statue and flag pole.

Mr. Veith said the use of the chain link was restrained and there would be no barbed wire. He said that there are remaining plantings, the fence is restricted in extent and associated with outside space and doesn't interfere with the landmark. He noted the door solution is good and the presentation seen today reflected many discussions at ARC.

Ms. Strong said she was not on the Board when the earlier additions to firehouses were done but she said she has noticed it is always of a different material or a different paint color to distinguish itself and she doesn't see that here; she noted that here it was not differentiated.

Responding to Ms. Strong's inquiry, Mr. Abelsen said the ARC thought that the subdued, more neutral color works off the existing palette was reasonable. He said it is a variable that depends on the massing, its location and how visible it is going to be; in this case it is the back side of the building and is more visible from the park than from the street.

Mr. Veith noted that the darker tone on the new addition and the south side of the former addition; he said that those have been intentionally matched so that you are clearer from that perspective what is not original and one can see the difference between the old and new.

Ms. Wirsching agreed; she asked for clarification on the memorial.

Ms. Chave said the memorial is part of the site and while it is not called out in the application it will be temporarily removed and then reinstalled.

Ms. Wirsching noted it seems reasonable.

Mr. Veith noted that it falls within the Guidelines.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed renovation and addition, including replacement of the apparatus bay doors, and associated site alterations, including an emergency generator and a temporary tent structure, as per the submittal. This approval is conditional upon review and approval of the apparatus bay door construction details by the Board's Architectural Review Committee. This action is based on the following:

4. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 123289 as the proposed renovation and addition, and associated site alterations, do 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*.

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

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

090110.15

Fire Station #16

6846 Oswego Place NE

Proposed renovation, including replacement of apparatus bay door and emergency generator installation

Mr. Scales said that the one story concrete building was built in 1928 and renovated in 1980; he provided context of the site. He went over proposed changes and said it will mostly be interior renovations with some exterior modifications. He reported that seismic upgrades will be done, additional steel added to the concrete and rear bay doors; flooring will be installed in the handball court to accommodate officers' quarters. He said that two bedrooms will be created to provide gender separation. He said that the medic unit will be moving which will provide more room for the fire truck; they propose to remove the center column and put in one wider door with two panels on either side as infill with a solid wall. He said details on the door would be provided when they get a manufacturer.

Mr. Scales said three lights are on the front of the building and two will be added on the back and two added on the alley side. He said that the emergency generator will be placed on the roof and will be painted a gray color. He said they propose to repaint the building close to the current scheme. He said "Seattle Fire Department" will be over the doors on the flat painted area.

Board Questions:

Responding to Board questions Mr. Scales said their intention is to frame 3' wood frame plywood, flat sheets of metal, strips of steel, riveted to place to create a similar reveal as the door.

Discussion by Board members ensued about how the proposed door and panels would look; Ms. Chave explained that the applicant would be coming back with detail information on the doors.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wirsching said that based on the ARC reviews, the applicants have come a long way with the development of the door detail. She said that the apparatus bay door works well with the architecture of the historic building even though it is a single door.

Mr. Veith said that the proposed equipment on the roof is not very visible and the solution is perfectly acceptable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed renovation, including the replacement of the apparatus bay doors and the addition of an emergency generator, as per the submittal. This approval is conditional upon review and approval of the construction details of the apparatus bay door and the adjacent panels' details by the Board's Architectural Review Committee. This action is based on the following:

5. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 122464 as the proposed alterations do 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*.

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

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

090110.2 NOMINATION

090110.21 Beacon Reservoir Gatehouse
3801 Beacon Ave. S.

Mimi Sheridan, Architectural Historian on behalf of Seattle Public Utilities, presented the nomination report (full text available in DON file) and began by providing context of the site. She said she found no historic photos of the Gatehouse which was built in 1911. She provided history of the Water Department since 1889 and noted that a second pipeline was built in 1909. She said that the Olmsted Plan for Jefferson Park was not executed. She said that in WWII the area was used as a military exercise base.

Ms. Sheridan said that the Gatehouse is classically detailed and constructed of reinforced concrete brick. She said she didn't know why there was a door on the west side and didn't know if stairs had ever been built. She said there are no openings on either the north or south sides. She pointed out the deep cornice with

deep dentils. She said the windows, doors and transom had all been filled in. She said that the details around the doors and windows looked to be concrete.

Ms. Sheridan went over interior details and said the one concrete room space was original, noted the toilet room, the three groups of wheels used to operate the valves, and the hatches that provide access to the below ground equipment. She provided two large sheets of drawings of the space and noted that the rear door is not shown. She said she thought the drawing was done by City staff at the time.

Ms. Sheridan showed photos of other gatehouses in the area – at Cal Anderson Park and at Volunteer Park, both built in 1901 – and said these are older and better examples of gatehouses. She said gatehouses in Maple Leaf and Roosevelt, built in 1911 are more elaborate and both are still in use. She said the Beacon Reservoir Gatehouse has poor integrity, is not distinctive example of the style and that two earlier and better examples remain.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wirsching asked if there was any indication of influence by the Olmsted's.

Ms. Sheridan said that there was not; she said that they were involved with the design at Volunteer Park.

Mr. Veith noted that the Gatehouse is not shown on the Olmstead drawing even though it was already built.

Ms. Sheridan commented that Beacon was a good way to bring the pipe down for water.

Mr. Veith asked if when the Gatehouse was built the street grid was the same because of one of the commentary letters cited the Gatehouse as “greeting” them.

Ms. Sheridan said that the building is really just a valve house and noted that she thought the grid was there. She said there had been an old lab building there but she didn't know if the slope was always there. Responding to Board member questions she said that all the openings had been filled in and that she thought they had been filled in for fifth years at least. She said she found no early photos so doesn't know how the building was originally painted, if the windows were ever there and if so, how long they have been gone. She said that she didn't know if there were any historic trees there and noted that the site was very much changed during the war; she said there may be one strip left. She said there are no detailed planting lists.

Mr. Veith commented that the site may have been planned for University use.

Ms. Sheridan said that the school was never on site.

Public Comment:

Mark Holland read from a letter he sent to the Board (full text available in DON file) and said there is a difference between the documents used by SPU and those used by

HRA. He said the HRA document was more reliable. He said he wants the Gatehouse saved and landmarked.

Mira Latoszek, Jefferson Park Alliance, supported nomination of the Gatehouse and said the park is used by the Beacon Hill community. She said the park had been the site of Japanese Language School picnics in the 1920s and 1930s. She said that after the war the reservoirs were enclosed with fences and were made inaccessible to keep the water system safe. She said that the Gate house is not architecturally fancy as the others but noted that Beacon Hill is a working class community and that the Gatehouse is a reflection of the neighborhood. She said buildings should be preserved that reflect the area and the people around them. She said the Gatehouse and park are used by the community and they plan to renovate the Gatehouse and to make the area around it an educational landscape about the history of the water system.

Frederica Merrell, North Beacon Hill Planning Team, supported nomination and said the area is one of low to moderate income people. She said this is the last remaining building that reminds us of the reservoirs. She said the location of the Gatehouse – geographically and topographically significant – makes the Gatehouse a significant point of interest and off sets all other buildings. She said the community wants the Gatehouse to stay. She said it has a solid floor, a good paint job, the valves are all there. She said the graffiti was added during a construction project and wasn't there before.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Finrow said that he was moved by the neighborhood concern; he said he wanted to hear other perspectives because he could say “yes”.

Ms. Wirsching commented that it was good to hear from the public but noted that SPU owns it. She expressed concern that the good intention to renovate the Gatehouse may never be realized. She said she agreed with the Staff Report and would not support nomination.

Mr. Savage said that while it is a wonderful period piece of the park he agreed with the Staff Report and would not support nomination. He suggested SPU and Parks come to some agreement with the community on its use.

Mr. Luoma said that he appreciates the park and design history. He said with regard to integrity, the surface is marred but noted the inner working components and its association with reservoirs. He noted the difficulty to pinpoint a criterion but said he thought F was the best because it is an identifiable feature in the neighborhood and also noted that it is a reminder of reservoirs and how they worked. He said he was leaning toward supporting nomination but would like a better understanding of how the building is perceived in the public right of way.

Ms. Strong said she agreed with Messrs. Finrow and Luoma and said there is more info to be gleaned. She cited Criterion F and said the building does stand out and that she would support nomination.

Ms. Wine said she agreed with Mr. Luoma that the building has integrity. She said that the windows and doors are not there but one can get a sense of what the building was. She said she loosely could support Criterion F because it is an identifiable feature of the neighborhood. She noted she didn't want to overlook the significance of modest buildings. She supported nomination.

Ms. Howard thanked community members for their comments and said that the board doesn't consider potential future uses as part of the process. Regarding Criterion A and events cited by community members she said that the Gatehouse wasn't central to those events. She said with regard to Criterion C, Cal Anderson Park and Volunteer Park were significant because they were the first. Regarding Criterion D she said that while the Gatehouse may be reflective of the neighborhood it doesn't embody a style. She said that she would support nomination based on Criterion F so she can explore it more fully.

Mr. Veith agreed with Ms. Howard and said the Board does not consider future use. He said that condition and integrity are different and noted that bad paint and graffiti can be overlooked but that integrity tells whether there is enough of the original building to convey its significance. He said that it is an "iffy" nomination but that he is willing to support it at nomination. He said he has doubts about the design and integrity and said there is not a clear match for the criteria. Regarding criteria C and F he said because the building has prominence he wants to go look at it and then he noted the water system development and said it marked a significant event in the City's history. He said that other areas such as South Park and Duwamish wanted to become part of the City to take advantage of the water. He said that Ms. Sheridan did a good job on the nomination report noting the completeness, elegance and economy. He noted the value of more information but said it was unlikely that he would vote to designate.

Ms. Abelsen noted the general consensus for supporting nomination. He cited R.H. Thomson's book noting it contains a lot of history about sewer and water systems; he said Thomson was not connected to this building. He acknowledged the loss of integrity where windows in the design had been removed (or not installed) but noted the infill had been there for a while. He said reasons for filled in windows should be explored and clarified. He noted the community support but said there are limited options on how to consider a nomination; he said the Board must rely on the Ordinance. He said he leaned toward favoring Criterion F.

Mr. Finrow commented that all the underground piping and the valves are still there; he said the Gatehouse is as much about that as the exterior.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Beacon Reservoir Gatehouse at 3801 Beacon Ave. S. for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the interior and exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for October 6, 2010; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

Ms. Strong made the motion as written above.

Mr. Veith amended the motion to include the interior and exterior of the building.
MM/SC/TV/JF 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Savage opposed.

Action on original motion with Mr. Veith's amendment:
MM/SC/MS/JF 7:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Wirsching and Mr. Savage
opposed.

Mr. Finrow left at 6:35 p.m.

090110.3 PUBLIC HEARING

090110.31 Fort Lawton Landmark District Design Guidelines

Presentation followed by public comment

Karen Gordon provided background on the landmark designation of this district noting that the original Designation Ordinance for the district was passed in 1988, and was updated two years ago. She explained that per Chapter 25 of the Seattle Municipal Code guidelines must be developed and noted Harvard Belmont and Columbia City Review Committee as examples. She explained that the Officers' Housing will be changed to private hands, and the anticipation of the ability to do some infill to existing buildings (officer houses). She noted the participation of numerous groups in the process of creating guidelines. She said that four zones have been created: the Chapel, Parade, Montana Circle and the Washington Avenue.

Susan Boyle, BOLA Architects, presented the report (full text available in DON file). She explained the existing color scheme. She explained the intent to "condominiumize" the units and proposed inclusion of individualized door colors. She said that there is no proposed change to the single family houses but explained that the u-shaped duplexes – with the opening in the back – would potentially be filled in with a one story addition. She said the windows and cladding will be maintained and additions will have a contemporary profile to distinguish from the original buildings. She said that the second floor bathroom addition has been revised with a hip roof and taller windows similar to existing so as to fit better with existing.

Ms. Boyle said that trash, bicycles, recycling will be hidden from view by wood lattice low walls. She said that each unit will have a two-car garage, and view corridors will be retained. She said that there will be no fencing or personal landscaping in order to retain the character of the site. She said they propose to congregate the mail area and create a play area.

Ms. Boyle went over the Montana Circle buildings which were built for non-commissioned officer housing. She said that all but one are duplexes and were constructed in 1899 and 1904. She said that two brick duplexes were added in the 1930s. She reported that there are safety issues with how the exits on the wood clad buildings exit to the street noting they exit onto very small porches. She said they propose to infill the doors and relocate the exits to porches to the side. She said there would be 75 square feet of infill on each duplex to re-orient the exits. She said the lap siding would be retained. The two-way drive would become a one-way drive with a small curb and enclosed areas with designated parking places to order cars and preserve views. She said that one additional pole light standard cast downward to illuminate each building without impacting the dark sky.

Ms. Boyle said there would be no changes to the brick duplexes. She said on the small 906 building the rickety non-original stairs on the back porch would be taken off and the area in-filled.

Ms. Gordon said that the guidelines adopted would include these changes so that future potential purchasers would know that the duplexes, the whole structure has to be built – not just one half of the duplex - so that what is allowed would be clear. She said that the final drawings will be part of the Certificate of Approval. She said it will be really clear to whoever is buying that these guidelines have been adopted and that we want some consistency – even though they are secondary facades (east) they should be treated as unit. She noted it was also to deal with the parking issues so people are not parking on grass or in the park or on the perimeter of the district. She said the guidelines would guide any treatment of buildings in a historic district; any kind of covenant or easement is a private agreement between different parties, not the City.

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Boyle explained there are 13 units on Officers' Row and 13 units on Montana Circle – each consisting of six duplexes and one single family home.

Ms. Gordon explained that when the Ordinance was originally adopted in 1988 there were more buildings in the District, and there was a compromise that a certain number of buildings were preserved along the parade; some were demolished and some had burned in a fire. She said that very strict language was put in by City Council that there would be no uses of those (the Parks owned) buildings. She said that even though these buildings are intended as residential, the Board's jurisdiction is limited to the design, not the use. She said that the Guidelines reflect the fact that the City-owned properties are not being used so that when one talks about things like garages that are not being used – there is a requirement that they be maintained, which the Parks Department is doing. Starting on page 3 - 8 of the guidelines are overall district guidelines which is the umbrella and then it is narrowed down to each zone. She said there are above-ground utilities now and she noted the anticipation of future improvements so that was included in the guidelines.

Public Comment:

William Newsome, Magnolia neighborhood, said that Discovery Park is unique and requested levels of behavior at least as restrictive as one would get in holdings in National Parks noting there are things that one can and can't do. He said the restrictions on people should be as rigorous as they are in National Parks.

Kathleen Conner, Parks Department, reported that she sent a letter to the Board (full text available in DON file) and commented that Parks supports the Guidelines as written. She said they will help to manage the park while retaining its historic character. She said they would like to retain flexibility to manage the park; for example the Certificate of Approval for all trees. She said that the Dark Sky compliant exterior lighting is an issue and noted that all of their buildings vacant. She said she felt it was a compromise to put in the Dark Sky compliant principle; she said they could abide by that but by citing a zoning light number. She said it adds another layer that is cumbersome. She said that with regard to the temporary seasonal decorations and signs she said that during military events she wants the users to be able to use flags etc. to

celebrate their particular event – she said they are short-term and don't have any long-term impact. She said that they have Parks standards in addition to that so when they issue event permits they have to have to meet standard.

Julia Allen and Consuela Larrabie read from a packet they provided to Board members (full text available in DON file). They stressed that the site is a City park and not a typical neighborhood and how the night-time darkness is important.

Michael Nanney, Forest City, explained that of the four zones two belong to Parks and two are Navy-owned. He said the ownership had been conveyed to Forest City. He said the guidelines process had been inclusive noting the involvement of all interested parties. He stated they will sell the properties. He said the Guidelines do not reflect everything they wanted but overall they support them.

Mr. Nanney said that cutting of trees must be reviewed by the Board and he noted the recommended caliper of tree be included in the Guidelines. He noted that the lighting will be downlit with timers and motion control sensors. He said they would use the minimum lighting to accomplish the purpose and noted they were not in favor of the Dark Skies because safety and security are key for current and future residents. He noted the public comment about disallowing wind chimes and said that real people will live in the houses and may want wind chimes. He supported the flexibility of residents being able to select the color of the doors noting the limited palette proposed to select from. He noted that the owner of a duplex should be allowed to slightly differentiate their unit if they want and said that it doesn't take away from the historic character of the site.

Ms. Boyle said that she didn't think that the FAA property, which may have had some of the disturbing lights is being changed in ownership. She noted there are different kinds of roofing on the houses on Officer's Row and they will be proposing a consistent roofing material so there will be consistency.

Ms. Chave and Ms. Gordon said they will arrange a tour of the District for Board members.

090110.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

090110.41 Metropolitan Printing Press Building
2107 Third Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Chave explained the request for an extension of six months.

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Metropolitan Printing Press Building for a period of six months.

MM/SC/TV/CH 8:00 Motion carried.

090110.5 BOARD BUSINESS

090110.6 STAFF REPORT

7:40 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator