



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 409/11

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, September 7, 2011 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Jerry Finrow
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock
Steve Savage
Marie Strong
Alison Walker Brems
Elaine Wine
Meredith Wirsching, Vice Chair

Staff

Karen Gordon
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Mark Hannum
Christine Howard

Vice Chair Meredith Wirsching called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

090711.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of July 20, 2011

**MM/SC/SS/MS
abstained.**

7:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Luoma

090711.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

090711.21 Seaboard Building
1500 4th Avenue
Proposed storefront alterations

Ron Pizarro, Nelson Architects, explained the new façade would go on the west façade facing the plaza and explained drawing details. He provided material samples and said the change would have minimal impact to the building. He said they will remove the existing glass panel and insert metal panel material. He said the dark bronze frame will match existing material. He provided a correction sheet for page 6 and said the lighting fixture will be affixed to the new material with screws and a hole will be drilled for the conduit. He said that the light sits down below the awning and it tucked up and underneath. Responding to clarifying questions he explained that the interior wall would be attached flush with interior pilaster and that he would send the updated drawing to Ms. Sodt. He said that there will be lights in the ATM cabinet.

Ms. Sodt noted that the store front system is not original and was installed in the 1980s or 1990s; she said it is a very dark bronze store front system.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Finrow said it was reasonable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations, at the Seaboard Building, 400 Pike Street.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #114769 as the proposed work does 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*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

090711.22 Shafer Building
515 Pine Street

Proposed storefront alterations

Jeff Stuart, designer, explained the plan to renovate the existing storefront to turn it into two. He provided historic photos of the building to show what the building looked like at street level. He showed photos of other storefronts on this building and pointed out that there is no consistency in storefronts now. He explained the plan to remove the large Starbucks's sign and flip access to the store. A new concept store is being added and will use the existing entry. He said that they will put in a bronze anodized aluminum storefront to match what is there now.

Mr. Stuart provided information on the new standalone store and said they intended for it to share back of house functionality but that it will have its own defined look. He said they intend to maintain the tile band at the base and the upper bulkhead but for the new concept store they will install oak strips.

Board Questions:

ARC members reported that they had requested photos of other storefronts around the building which the applicant provided; the photos showed the variation of store fronts on the block.

Mr. Stuart said that the wood strips will carry into the store and will be finish nailed to the non-historic MDL board and new signage will go into the bulkhead.

Eric Hobb, Starbucks, said the choice of oak strips is to differentiate the new concept store from its neighbors. He reiterated that all the retail units are different and nothing ties them together.

Responding to clarifying questions Mr. Stuart said that the interior screen will be floated off the interior glass surface about 4" and will be attached to the inner bulkhead. The screen will cover a work area on the back.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Finrow had no problem with the application.

Mr. Savage didn't think it was sympathetic to the historic character.

Mr. Luoma said that it seem light but noted the nearby Eileen Fisher storefront that is white. He said the material, texture and pattern will read differently but there is no original storefront fabric there so he had no concern.

Mr. Murdock had no problem with the application.

Ms. Strong noted a challenge in giving pedestrians an experience of historic nature of the building. She said that this will be a departure from existing 'urban sophisticate' store front.

Ms. Walker Brems said the photos were helpful in providing context and noted that there was no continuity on the ground floor. She said that the oak will date the storefront very quickly and it will be changed soon.

Ms. Wirsching said it is being attached to non-historic fabric and is reversible.

Ms. Wine said that the canopy provides a separation/barrier from the historic building and doesn't impact the overall building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed storefront alterations and alley elevation mechanical equipment, at the Shafer Building, 515 Pine Street.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #113430 as the proposed work does 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*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/AL/JF

8:0:0 Motion carried.

090711.3 NOMINATIONS

090711.31 Pacific Net & Twine Building
51 University Street

Architectural historian Karen Link prepared and presented the nomination report (full report available in DON file). She provided context of the area and noted this is one of several substantial buildings within the Commission District – a warehouse district. She explained that by the 1880s the neighborhood housed a variety of businesses over the years. She said that the fire of June 6, 1889 demolished the heart of the district. She explained that the area was rebuilt with added railroad tracks and additional piers were built. She noted that the pre-fire Schwabacher warehouse still exists and went on to note the correlation between piers and their corresponding warehouses.

Ms. Link explained that Pacific Net and Twine merged with Marine Supply in the mid-1920s and was an important provider of materials. They later merged with Schwabacher and became Pacific Marine Schwabacher. She noted the building's consistent association with the Maritime industry. She said the area was part of the early development of downtown Seattle.

Ms. Link explained the details of the 6-story reinforced concrete building with basement, mezzanine and penthouse levels with regular floor plan. She pointed out the six recessed bays on the Western Ave. elevation separated by concrete piers, distinctive brick ornament at the top of piers, brick spandrels that contrast with concrete lintels and sills, distinctive ornament above the mezzanine level on face of the piers. She noted the top four floors' clear glass and tri-partite composition which replaced multi-paned sash.

She said the north elevation has a similar composition to Western Avenue and she pointed out a major alteration from the 1980s - the exposed mechanical at the center. At the penthouse elevation she said that windows had been changed since 2007.

She said that on the west elevation garage openings at the 2nd and 5th bays were replaced by new concrete steps and platforms. The stoops are topped by new sheet metal awnings. There is compatible multi-pane glazing in the four central bays at the mezzanine levels and stoops flank roll up garage doors. She said that the windows have been removed from the southern bay and a concrete fill behind the opening. There are also filled in mezzanine windows at the first bay from the north and new windows. She said that the overall exterior conditions have retained its character-defining features including its cladding and distinctive ornament.

Ms. Link explained that architect John Graham practiced architectural from 1901 – 1940s. She noted some of his important works such as the Joshua Green, Ford Motor Assembly, and Frederick and Nelson buildings. She said the building met Criterion E and was an outstanding example of a growing designer. She said that the building is a type of well-designed warehouse and would meet Criterion D.

Board Questions:

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Link explained that a seismic retrofit has not been done to the building and that ground floor modifications go back to the 1980s remodel. She said that the ornamentation at the mezzanine level is tile.

Owner's representative Larry Costich explained that they are supportive of the nomination process and the three criteria just reviewed. He said that they are mindful of changes coming to the neighborhood and that they want to be able

to program the building for the future particularly in regard to adaptive reuse. He said they had met with staff and talked about the process they would be going through – nomination, designation to Controls and Incentives. He said that there have been changes in the earlier report that has since been updated.

Bob Kovalenko explained the nomination of the exterior is historically relevant and he questioned how the non-historical elements would be handled. He said that the work by Ellis and Walker shouldn't be considered part of the historic fabric of the building.

Ms. Sodt explained that generally the board will nominate the entire exterior of a building and during Controls and Incentives phase what is controlled can be narrowed down. She said that storefront changes, rooftop systems and penthouses possibly could be reviewed administratively.

Mr. Costich explained to the extent that there are special features that they will examine for preservation they wanted to open the discussion about the process.

Ms. Sodt explained that the minutes will reflect what the board has focused on in terms of changes made to the building. She said that it is helpful to have those changes discussed and in the minutes.

Mr. Kovalenko listed changes to the building including the roof penthouse, awnings, entry, center ventilation system, western elevation with concrete stoops and docks and stairs, windows, roll up doors, exterior windows are not historic, and store fronts are not historic.

Ms. Link agreed.

Mr. Kovalenko said it is a great building and another gift from John Graham to the City.

West elevation:

Mr. Costich asked for the west elevation image to be shown and said that where the front of the façade had been historically may change in the short term.

Mr. Kovalenko said it will be on a boulevard so the openings will be more important as they do adaptive reuse – it will no longer be the 'back of a warehouse'. While it may still read as a warehouse the ground floor may become retail/commercial with more transparency.

Ms. Sodt said that any changes that won't be covered by administrative reviewed would be reviewed by the board.

Ms. Strong asked if the owner's representatives had any other changes they wanted noted in the record.

Mr. Kovalenko said that was it.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Finrow called the building 'great' and said it was worthy of nomination. He expressed concern about the replacement of glazing noting they were more than 50% of the façade. He said he likes the building and its detailing.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination also calling it a 'great' building. He said there has been some loss of integrity – the windows and storefront changes. He noted the simple utilitarian character of the building as originally designed and said it lends itself better to changes. He said that a distinctive characteristic is the large transparent openings and suggested retention of the transparency and expanse of windows.

Mr. Murdock agreed and said he supported nomination. He noted the Olsen Sunberg work 23 years ago and said that he has no problem with it. He said he loved the building and that it expresses what it does; he pointed out the way the ventilation is expressed. He said the loss of windows was troubling.

Ms. Walker Brems supported nomination and said it is a great building and a great architect. She said she wouldn't say no because the windows were replaced.

Ms. Wine supported nomination and said that the building and structure is evocative of an industrial warehouse and that it was worthy of preserving. She said that some of the changes made by Olson Sunberg may be historic in their own right.

Ms. Strong concurred and said the building reflects its original use and style of the building.

Action: I move approval of the Pacific Net & Twine Building at 51 University Street 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; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for October 19, 2011; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

090711.32 Boren Investment Company Building
334 Boren Avenue North

Kristen Jensen, development manager with Touchstone, said they purchased the Troy block and would work with the City to integrate the laundry into their redevelopment. She said there is significant environmental contamination and they will have to remove soil to a depth of 50 – 60’ and said that the building does not meet landmark criteria.

Larry Johnson, architectural historian, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report available in DON file). He provided context of the site and noted that the north and west are the primary facades. He went over the ornamentation on the parapet, the buttresses, masonry details, tapestry brick, and noted that original canopy over the loading dock was missing. He said that the building did not meet criteria A, B, or C. He said that it is one of many industrial buildings in the area and that it is smaller than others in the area that are landmarked. He said that the brick is the most character-defining thing about the building. He said that the building did not meet Criterion D and said that it is a minimally decorated brick warehouse.

Mr. Johnson showed other examples of architect Stuart Wheatley’s work which included lots of apartment buildings in the Tudor Gothic Style; he said this building is not included in his architectural portfolio. He said the building is not an outstanding example of his work and does not meet Criterion E. He said that the building is not easily identified and is hard to see because it is a block off the main drag. He said that the building did not meet Criterion F. He said that the building has good integrity but doesn’t meet any criteria.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wine asked about the parapet material.

Mr. Johnson said the capstone was GI coping. He said that the windows are original as far as he could tell.

Ms. Wirsching asked about the context of the building in relation to other area warehouses.

Mr. Johnson said that there weren’t any. He said that the plan on page A3 shows the context of the building in relation to other warehouse buildings in the area and noted there are a couple concrete warehouses. He said that there has been much redevelopment pressure in the area and much has been torn down.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if the aerial photograph was recent.

Mr. Johnson said that there is a lot of major development along Westlake and it is a very changed neighborhood. He said that he can map out other warehouses in the area. He said that there are still some major ones there. Responding to clarifying question he said that the only modification to the building is the removal of two canopies and the grade change on the south side; he said there were changes to the interior.

Public Comment:

Colleen Dooley explained she had gotten a Small and Simple grant to do a survey of the neighborhood. She said there is an interesting eclectic mix of buildings and types. She said the building is a vestige of the past and remains a functioning resource noting its heavy timber structural framing and its high degree of integrity. She called it an honest uniform industrial style and said that the freight doors are original; the hardware is intact and original and shows the utilitarian functional nature of the building. She said that this building type is being lost and that it compares handsomely to others in the area. She supported nomination based on Criterion C and D.

Christine Lea said that there are few grand warehouses as part of the once warehouse district. She said that the building distinguishes itself from the massing of the newer buildings and would meet Criterion F and noted its human scale. She pointed out its counterpoint to the new designs and development in the area which wipe out the massing and erode the character of the neighborhood. She said that the entire structure meets criteria C, D, and F. She said that historic preservation was listed as a priority in their neighborhood plan 15 years ago.

Karin Link said that the building has a high level of integrity noting the red brick, coping and original sash windows. She said that it met criteria C, D, and F. She said that this was a unique building for Stuart Wheatley and that a building would not be put into a portfolio unless he was trying to sell it or the design. She said that the building ties into the Troy Laundry and stands out.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine noted the building's integrity and said that smaller buildings get discounted because of their scale and utilitarian nature. She commented on the elegance of this small building with tall sash windows and noted the amount of volume on the interior with its heavy timber framing and light monitors. She supported nomination on Criterion D.

Mr. Finrow said that the building is interesting and nice and has good integrity but that it doesn't rise to the level of landmark status.

Ms. Walker Brems called the building a "sister" to the other historic buildings in the district. She said that a site plan pointing out relationships to other historic industrial buildings would be helpful. She commented on the character-defining proportion, the massing and the building's tall elegant windows. She said that very few modifications to the interior. She supported nomination.

Mr. Savage said that it was a simple concrete brick and timber building and noted that the canopies were gone. He said that the building belongs in a district and as a standalone doesn't rise to the level of a landmark. He did not support nomination.

Ms. Strong noted the building's integrity and said that it positions itself nicely. She said that it is representative of the neighborhood. She said that it had a unique feel and a distinctive interior. She supported nomination to explore the building further.

Mr. Luoma said the building has integrity even though it is just bricks and windows without a lot of ornamentation. He supported nomination to explore further its significance to the economic character of the district. He said that it could meet Criterion D and noted that it is also has a distinct and visible character for that period.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination calling the building a vital part of the overall quality identification of the neighborhood and economic heritage of the neighborhood.

Ms. Wirsching did not support nomination saying that the building was attractive but had no significant architectural or cultural significance to indicated is it a landmark.

Action: I move approval of the Boren Investment Company Warehouse Building at 334 Boren Avenue North 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; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for October 19, 2011; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/EW/MS

5:3:0 Motion carried. Messrs. Finrow and Savage and Ms. Wirsching opposed.

090711.4

BOARD DISCUSSION

090711.41 **Fort Lawton Landmark District Design Guidelines**
Presentation followed by public comment

Karen Gordon explained that the guidelines were developed to give owners certainty and consistency in what is allowed and what is not. She said that they have consistently used similar language used in other guidelines and noted that it would allow Parks manage its business without multiple approvals. She said that lighting wattage would not be mandated given the different levels of lighting needed in different situations. Responding to board member comments she said that the landscape plan is not static and the guidelines will apply until a new plan is adopted.

Mr. Luoma commented on page 4 that no Certificate of Approval would be required to add a tree less than 8”; he said that most trees would fall under that because most new trees are 2 – 4” in caliper.

Responding to Board member comments about gazebos, awnings, fencing, solar panels and temporary political signs, Ms. Gordon said that the guidelines will be clear about what is allowed. She said that solar panels could go on the back sides and not be visible, and political signs are a free speech issue. She said she would email an illustration of the various zones. She said that the discussion was to get direction from board members and will come back for further review.

Public Comment:

Consuelo Larrabee read through an August 22, 2011 letter from the Friends of Discovery Park, “Requested Additions & Changes” (available in DON file).

Kathleen Conner, Parks Department, said that she was pleased with how the guidelines address the Certificate of Approval process. She said she supported the proposed guidelines which she said would allow effective management of the park. She said Parks had managed the district for over 30 years and that they plan to maintain the district. She said that the Certificate of Approval process will be used for some things and said that the spirit of the Vegetative Management plan would be used as an overarching guide. She said they wanted to keep their options open on the lighting. She said that the term “lowest watt” is subjective.

Ms. Conner said that “seasonal” affects their ability to schedule events. She said that the district was the heart of military history and that they have provided permits for special events. She said that they want to be able to continue to schedule events. She said that signage should be flexible. She said that they did not want to restrict the use of the new parking area and don’t want to preclude the ability to apply for grants in the future.

Mr. Finrow suggested making a list of how often special uses occur to give board members some sense of what that means.

Susan Boyle said with regard to the lighting she explained that technology for lighting has changed.

Michael Nanney, Forest City, noted that much effort had been expended in the guidelines process. He suggested clarifying that zones 3 and 4 are not in Discovery Park and that they are owned by the Navy; they are surrounded by the park but are not in the park. He noted the importance of lighting to providing a sense of security and safety between house and garage. He said that temporary seasonal decorations are up a minority of time and that families should be allowed to do family stuff.

Mr. Nanney explained that the houses were 100 years old and that lead paint has flaked off and leached through water run-off. He said that there is lead contamination in a 15' radius around the homes. He said that they are developing a cleanup plan which will have to be submitted to the Department of Ecology. He said that landscape architect Karen Kiest is working on a site replanting plan. He said that many of the trees are within the 15' radius and in lead contaminated soil; he said that they will try to keep them. With regard to moving outside food prep to the rear of the homes he said that most houses abut an alley and said that it would make sense to move outside food prep to the side yards.

Ms. Gordon noted revisions would be made in the guidelines for lighting, temporary seasonal displays, awning color, screen door and landscaping/tree removal.

Board discussion ensued. It was suggested that window shades all be one specified uniform color. There was discussion around landscape and trees and it was suggested that small scale plantings, shrubs, ground cover, and perennials, and trees smaller than 6" caliper not require Certificate of Approval. It was recommended that Staff review landscape items first and then send to the board. Discussion ensued about lighting and the difficulty to specify the wattage because light standards change. Shielding, sensors and timers were suggested and flexibility encouraged as technology changes.

Ms. Gordon said that more information would be coming from Parks and that another draft would be ready for review in late October.

090711.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

090711.51 YWCA Building
1118 5th Avenue

Request for extension

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the YWCA Building for three months.

MM/SC/EW/MS 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Walker-Brems left at 6:45 p.m.

090711.52 George Washington Carmack House
1522 E. Jefferson Street
Request for extension

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the George Washington Carmack House for two months.

MM/SC/JF/SS 7:0:0 Motion carried.

090711.53 Metropolitan Printing Press Company Building
2107 Third Avenue
Request for extension

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

MM/SC/JF/AL 7:0:0 Motion carried.

090711.54 Barksdale House
13226 42nd Ave. NE

Action: I move to extend the period for consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Barksdale House for two months.

MM/SC/JF/SS 7:0:0 Motion carried.

090711.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator