



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 460/09

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, September 2, 2009 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Stephen Lee
Vernon Abelsen
Tom Veith
Christine Howard
Mark Hannum
Marie Strong
Aaron Luoma
Meredith Wirsching
Steve Savage
Mollie Tremaine

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodd
Melinda Bloom
Rebecca Frestedt

Absent

Alyce Conti

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:35pm.

090209.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Meeting of August 5, 2009
Approval of minutes deferred to next meeting.

090209.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

090209.21 3829A S. Edmunds St.
Empire Coffee
(Columbia City Landmark District)
Proposed business identification signage.

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed installation of a flag-mounted blade sign on the S. Edmunds St. façade. Raised aluminum lettering will be accented with red LED halo lighting. A three dimensional powder coated steel cup will be mounted below the blade sign. Plans and photographs were provided. Ms. Frestedt said the Board approved a blade sign for Selander O'Brien PLLC at 3829C S. Edmunds in June 2009. The Board also approved a revision to the building's sign plan in May 2009. The plan states that vertical signs shall not exceed 6'. The CCRC determined that the current proposal meets the criteria of the sign plan. On August 21, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for the proposed signage.

Philip Christofides, from Arellano Christofides, explained the two-sided blade sign is vertical which fits the design of the building. He said the background is a light champagne gold and the shadows are raised a bit. Halo lighting will light up the black to wash the gold with a soft red; the preferred lighting consists of red halo LED. He explained that an art element – a powder-coated sheet metal cup – is under construction. He said when it arrives he will be better able to ascertain method of attachment based on its weight. He said it will be independent of the blade sign and will be painted out a true china cup color – a soft off white. Responding to Board questions he noted that only the letter shadow is offset from the panel as an optical trick and they will make it as flat as possible. He explained that the LED will be hidden inside the black shadow pieces, tucked inside void of the lettering piece.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Messrs. Hannum and Abelsen noted that the applicant had responded to concerns raised by the Columbia City Review Committee and that out of three options provided this was the preferred option. Mr. Abelsen noted the novel idea for signage.

Mr. Veith cited the Columbia City Design Guidelines for signs noting that back lit signs are prohibited but stated that in this case the sign doesn't fit conveniently into the Code. He stated that the design is interesting and is acceptable. He went on to say that he did not consider the signage to be back lit and that LED technology is too recent to have been included into the Guidelines.

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 Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

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

Relevant guidelines

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.

b. Blade Signs. Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

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.

MM/SC/MH/VA

8:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Howard arrived at 3:50 p.m.

090209.22

Hepler Building

4909 Rainier Ave. S.

Wabi Sabi

(Columbia City Landmark District)

Signage: Proposed business identification signs.

Exterior alterations: Proposed alterations to a window opening on the rear façade to accommodate mechanical duct work and HVAC equipment.

Street use: Proposal to place three planters in the right-of-way in front of the storefront.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the Board would consider three separate applications related to this business. She said she would introduce them one at a time and the Board would act on each one separately.

Ms. Frestedt said that the first application was for installation of two (2) business identification signs, consisting of an aluminum blade sign suspended from the canopy, illuminated by two directional lights mounted behind the awning fascia; and, an aluminum window sign hung from the interior, featuring a neon border. She pointed out that the proposal included the addition of three (3) potted plants located on the sidewalk underneath the canopy. Plans, photographs and specification sheets were provided. She provided background information and said the Hepler Building which was built in 1908 is a contributing building to the District. She said the canopy was added in the 1930s. The CCRC received a briefing on the proposed sign plan at the July 2009 CCRC meeting. She noted that on August 21, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for business identification signage and landscaping.

Restaurant owner Thoa Nguyen introduced sign contractor Roger Ligano from Neon Electric Signs, who explained that the non-illuminated sign would be installed under the canopy with two can lights aimed at the canopy. He explained the sign would be 2” thick aluminum with flat bar across the top.

Ms. Frestedt confirmed that the sign itself isn’t illuminated.

Mr. Ligano noted the logo will be painted directly onto the sign. He said the window sign will be an oval of the same layout, painted with same brush stroke design. It will be feature oval neon around the perimeter. He indicated on a plan where the light fixture would be mounted. The interior oval signs will employ a GDL3500 designer white – a mellow white. – neon tube. They will employ a typical neon attachment method and will sit about 2 – 3” off the glass.

Ms. Frestedt suggested if the Board approves the design and placement of the sign it could be conditional on attachment details being submitted to Staff for review.

Ms. Nguyen explained the proposal for three planters to be placed at the front and that they would not obstruct the sidewalk usage or ADA. Ms. Frestedt noted that SDOT would require a permit for the planters because they would be in the right-of-way.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said the CCRC reviewed the application and said it met the Guidelines. He said the light fixture at the canopy was inconspicuous with the conduit out of sight and the planters are a great addition.

Mr. Lee indicated support for the application.

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

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

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

Relevant guidelines

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

7. Street Use. Any work that affects a street, alley, sidewalk, or other public right-of-way, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board. Emphasis shall be placed on creating and maintaining pedestrian-oriented public spaces and rights-of-way. Street trees and other plant materials that add human enjoyment to the District

shall be encouraged. Decorative treatments within the sidewalk, including special paving patterns and building entryway tiling shall be preserved. The use of alleys for services and public-oriented activities shall be encouraged.

8. Street Furniture. All elements of street furniture, including but not limited to street lights, benches, trash receptacles, and planters, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board as to their specific compatibility with the District. Street furniture must be appropriately sized and sited to afford generous provisions for pedestrian flow.

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.

b. Blade Signs. Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

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.

h. Neon Signs. Neon may be permitted where judged appropriate on a case-by-case basis. Size, letter style, color, intensity and overall impact of the neon sign shall be evaluated for compatibility with the other signs and buildings in the District. If a Plexiglas backing is proposed, it shall be clear and colorless. Neon signs should be designed to reflect the unique nature of the use within the building.

MM/SC/MS/CH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed installation of grease duct and exhaust fan on the rear façade. She said the proposal includes a penetration into the masonry (18" x 18" opening) to accommodate equipment. The duct will be supported by brackets attached at the mortar joints. A louver will be installed in an existing window opening to serve the duct and HVAC equipment. Plans, drawings, specification details, and material samples were provided. On August 21, 2009 the

Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for exterior alterations.

Ms. Nguyen reiterated Ms. Frestedt's comments and added the equipment will not be visible from the street noting it has to be 10' from the alley. She said the louver is going to be installed in an existing opening and the duct work will be painted to match the building. She noted that the existing chimney is not in use. She said running the duct through the interior was not an option because there is living space above and it would be disruptive to the tenant.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen said it is adjacent to the alley, set back far and is not visible.

Mr. Lee noted it was a code requirement for the restaurant.

Mr. Hannum noted the limited visibility.

Mr. Veith said that while the exhaust might be visible the whole unit can be removed and the building returned to the original state.

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 Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

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

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property.

MM/SC/MH/MS

9:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for proposed installation of HVAC and refrigeration equipment. She said refrigeration lines will be routed through an existing penetration from an abandoned flue vent. The proposal includes installation of an aluminum intake louver in an existing window opening. The louver will be painted to match the existing window trim. No structural modifications will be made to the masonry. Plans, specification details, and material samples were provided. On August 21, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for exterior alterations.

Ms. Nguyen explained that it is a simple HVAC unit with the refrigeration line going through the flue vent up to the roof; the compressor on the roof will be placed 10' back from property line and will not be visible from the street.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen noted the compressor will not be visible.

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 Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

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

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property.

MM/SC/MH/CH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

090209.23

Hepler Building

4909 Rainier Ave. S.

Spice Room

(Columbia City Landmark District)

Signage: Proposed business identification signs.

Exterior alterations: Proposed installation of mechanical equipment, consisting of exhaust ductwork on the rooftop and rear façade.

Summary of proposed changes:

Ms. Frestedt explained the application for a separate business (Spice Room) also in the Hepler Building, next door to Wabi-Sabi. She said the application is for the proposed installation of two (2) business identification signs, consisting of a 2-sided blade sign, featuring 1" thick projecting wood letters adhered to the sign. The sign (dimensions: 4'3" w x 1' 1½" h) will be constructed of wood and attached to horizontal metal poles. The sign will be suspended from the canopy and illuminated by two directional lights mounted to the canopy; and, a one-sided entry sign of the same design and proportions. She went on to explain the proposed installation of mechanical exhaust equipment on the rooftop and rear façade. The galvanized steel ductwork (16" x 16") will be attached by metal straps anchored into the masonry joints. An existing window opening will be modified to incorporate the ductwork. An exhausted fan will be placed on the roof. Plans, specification sheets and material samples were provided. On August 21, 2009 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval for exterior alterations and signage.

Project contractor Rick Barbour explained the main entry sign will go right above the door and will attach to existing structure of the canopy and will be illuminated with directional lights pointing at the front of the sign. He noted that attachment details were included in packets provided to Board members. He summarized the proposal for mechanical equipment and said it will go on the exterior of the rear façade. He said the equipment will fit into an existing window opening that had been in-filled in the past. He said they remove the non-original brick work and use the opening for the duct work. There will be no new penetrations and the work is reversible. In response to questions about the lighting he said the directional lights are preferred but will consider keeping the existing lights to make sure they don't cancel each other out; he said the existing lighting will be maintained. He noted the blade sign is centrally located.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee said it was a shame that the lighting is not consistent with the lighting proposed for the previous applicant since it is on the same facade.

Mr. Abelsen explained they had discussed angle and distance of the fixtures from the sign and noted that if the lights over the door are too far away they become ineffective.

Mr. Barbour noted they had discussed mounting them right beneath where the canopy drops down; if they did that it would create an oblique situation and would not be effective. There would also be the potential for it to shine right into the restaurant.

Mr. Abelsen said it would have been more helpful to see a ceiling plan of the lighting alignment.

Mr. Lee suggested the lighting portion be deferred to the next CCRC meeting on September 25. He said the lighting was a bit messy and it might require on-site adjustments to placement to see what the best position might be. He advised the applicant bring a ceiling plan to the CCRC meeting.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations and signage except for the directional lights. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

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

Relevant guidelines:

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.

b. Blade Signs. Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

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 for Rehabilitation

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property.

Action: Ms. Wirsching made a friendly amendment to add "defer final location for exterior lighting for signage to CCRC".

MM/SC/MW/CH	9:0:0	Motion on amendment carried.
MM/SC/MW/VA	9:0:0	Motion carried.

090209.24

Washington Athletic Club

1325 Sixth Avenue

Proposed awning details to be reviewed by ARC

Ms. Sodt went over the revision of the awning design and explained the mounting strategy is the same as what the Board has seen before and just the awning frame is different.

Ms. Strong noted it looked better and it ties in with the rest of the block.

Ms. Wirsching said bookending it with the awning on the other end is a benefit.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board members indicated support.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations, signage and lighting.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 122948 as the proposed work does not irreversibly 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.

090209.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

090209.31 (former) First United Methodist Church
811 Fifth Avenue

Ms. Sodt went over the signed agreement and said it was standard with the exception of administrative review of interior/exterior signage and interior/exterior painting. She said if staff feels the need for Board review that option is available. She said the organ pipes are controlled but not the organ console and the pulpit area is controlled but not the pulpit.

Action: I move to approve the Controls and Incentives Agreement for the (former) First United Methodist Church at 811 Fifth Avenue.

MM/SC/TV/CH

8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Savage recused himself.

090209.4 BOARD BRIEFING

090209.41 Columbia Plaza
4801 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Briefing on proposed demolition and preliminary design of the Columbia Plaza site. The proposed mixed-use development consists of ground floor retail, live/work units and upper level residential units.

Ms. Frestedt provided background information and explained that the CCRC reviewed the preliminary design proposal on August 21, 2009. She said the decision was split with three members recommending to deny the proposal and two members recommending to approve the proposal. Ms. Frestedt said that although the application for preliminary design is complete she received a request from the applicants on Monday, September 24, 2009 to postpone the Board's decision on the proposal. The applicants requested to conduct a briefing instead.

Jack McCullough, counsel for the applicant, noted the close vote by the Columbia City Review Committee and said that after fifteen months of meetings why not postpone the decision and have a few more meetings in order to move toward

agreement. He said that the applicants would like to move toward another briefing in October.

Ed Weinstein, project architect, provided an overview of the project and summarized the changes that have been made over time via PowerPoint. He pointed out where they had removed one full story on Edmunds, provided stepbacks on Edmunds and Rainier, pushed back the middle mass on the west façade and widened the sidewalks on Rainier and Edmunds. He said this brought the total number of units down from 308 to 276 resulting in utilizing 74% of the allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR). He noted they did studies on the elevations in the context of existing buildings and the heights in relation to the 65' height limit at the property line as well as the allowable envelope for Edmunds and for the Bank of America site. He showed various sight lines from the adjacent Bank of America site. He stated that the most significant aspect of the plan included the courtyard and privately managed public space. He pointed out the commercial area with the widened sidewalk, residential lobby and restaurant space.

Mr. Weinstein noted that each component of the building has subtly different plans and different elevations. He pointed out the step back roof and the terraces for units on Rainier and Edmunds. He noted the townhouses along the park. With regard to the north facade he said to recognize the height envelope for the intervening building that could be built there at some point. He pointed out the similar strategy to Edmunds at the Rainier elevation with the stepback. With regard to the end elevations he pointed out the inset windows along corridor and set backs on the upper floors. He said they patterned the two end walls differently. He provided elevation studies and noted the continuous marquee for weather protection, the varied materials and the perception of bays.

Mr. McCullough said their predicament is that their FAR is reduced 26% and they are down 100 units from what the site could accommodate under current zoning, understanding that no one ever builds to the zoning envelope. He said if they are only allowed to build a two- to four-story building then nothing will be built because the economics will not support it. He said he has been told there was a dichotomy between the zoning expectation of NC3-65 and the District's design guidelines that the Board is obligated to enforce. He said it is a false dichotomy. He doesn't find the tension. He asked the Board to consider the 1978 Columbia City Business District Plan and said that this is the plan that the guidelines are based on under LPB Code signed by Charlie Royer. He said this is the source of LPB authority and the guidance for what the board is supposed to be approving. He said it is interesting because the plan talks about this site specifically to be developed as mid-rise mass of high density residential over street level retail. He said it says the mass needs to be five stories. He noted the Design Guidelines under massing and scale; it talks about new development and of commercial development it says "...new development exceeding the typical one – three story height of the district..." which assumes that new development will exceed that height. He said that with the rules that are supposed to be followed, there is 65' zoning, a 1978 plan that says you need to have 5-story development on this site. He said that what is being proposed is a building that is 5-stories in some areas and 6-stories in others. He said the problem with a denial is that either the site gets mothballed with a fence around it or it will go through the Hearing Examiner process. He said it is worth taking the time to revisit the plan and reframe the proposal, looking at the 1978 Plan for guidance. He said they would like to come back in October to have a conversation about height, massing and scale as they think they were intended with suggestions from the Committee that don't involve taking off another story. He said the 1978 plan is

instructive and what the 1999 neighborhood plan says is that the development of this site is the single most critical piece to the long term development of this district. He said what he heard from the CCRC two weeks ago was recognition of that fact.

Mr. Lee thanked Mr. McCullough and asked if there was any public comment.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Frestedt asked if the Board had any questions. There were none.

090209.5 BOARD BUSINESS

Ms. Chave introduced new Get-Engaged Board member Aaron Luoma.

Ms. Sodt announced she was working on setting up a tour of the Virginia Mason properties.

Ms. Chave advised of the invitation for the annual auction event at the (former) Seventh Church of Christ, Scientist

090209.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator