



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 392/07

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, October 17, 2007– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen

Mollie Tremaine

Stephen Lee

Tom Veith

Christine Howard

Henry Matthews

John Schwartz

Staff

Sarah Sodd

Joanne Walby

Rebecca Frestedt

Karen Gordon

Absent

Ron Martinson

Mark Hannum

Alyce Conti

Czarina Nicholas

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

101707.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of September 19, 2007 deferred until the next meeting.

101707.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

101707.21 3827A S. Edmunds St./ RAM Columbia LLC/Last Loft
Columbia City Landmark District

Application: Proposed blade sign and band sign. The applicant proposes to install two business identification signs. The signs consist of 5” white vinyl letters applied to the 11” x 86” metal sign band above the windows and a

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

“Printed on Recycled Paper”

painted 22" x 14" wooden blade sign, featuring 5" vinyl letters. The sign will be attached to a matte black, tube steel stanchion and be attached to the mortar joints.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt presented drawings and attachments for details. Ms. Frestedt said the general sign plan for the Live Aboves was reviewed by the CCRC on November 4, 2005 and approved by the Board on November 16, 2005. The Board did not review the graphics or attachment details for the individual signs at the time of the sign plan approval. On September 27, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed signage.

Board Discussion: The Board determined that they had enough information to make a decision.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action:

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

MM/SC/JS/HM 7:0:0 Motion carried.

This action is based on the following:

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

Relevant Code citations and guidelines:

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

Design Guidelines - 11. Signs. Sign applications shall 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.

101707.22 3829D S. Edmunds St./ Read Write Learn
Columbia City Landmark District

Application: The applicant is proposing to install a blade sign. The sign will be 24"h x 24"w and be constructed with ½" MDO. The vinyl letters will be 2 ¾"h. The sign will be attached to a matte black, tube steel stanchion and be attached to the mortar joints.

Staff Report: As stated in the previous staff report, Ms. Frestedt confirmed that the general sign plan for the Live Aboves was reviewed by the CCRC on

November 4, 2005 and approved by the Board on November 16, 2005. The Board did not review the graphics or attachment details for the individual signs at the time of the sign plan approval. On September 27, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed signage.

Board Discussion: The Board determined that they had enough information to make a decision.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed exterior alterations. This action is based on the following:

MM/SC/HM/CH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

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

Relevant Code citations and Guidelines:

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

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 shall 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.

b. Blade Signs. Blade signs that are consistent in design with the 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.

101707.23 3829A S. Edmunds St./ Villa Victoria
Columbia City Landmark District

Application: Blade and neon window signs.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt said the applicant is proposing to install an aluminum blade sign, 24”h x 24”w. The vinyl logo and lettering will applied to the sign face. The sign will be attached to a matte black, tube steel stanchion and be secured into the mortar joints. The neon window sign is 12 mm white neon mounted over 10”h white vinyl letters on a clear acrylic

backing. The dimensions are 13”h x 48”w. The sign will be hung from the interior on the west facing window. Ms. Frestedt presented drawings and attachments for details.

Ms. Frestedt said the general sign plan for the Live Aboves was reviewed by the CCRC on November 4, 2005 and approved by the Board on November 16, 2005. The Board did not review the graphics or attachment details for the individual signs at the time of the sign plan approval. On September 27, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed signage.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen noted that the guidelines allow for neon if it is deemed “appropriate”. He asked what the CCRC said about its appropriateness. Ms. Frestedt said the sign is setback and would not cause glare for adjacent residences. She said that mass produced neon signs are discouraged in the District but this one is customized.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action:

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

MM/SC/MT/CH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

This action is based on the following:

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

Relevant Code citations and Guidelines:

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

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 shall 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.

b. Blade Signs. Blade signs that are consistent in design with the 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.

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

Guidelines - 11. Signs. Sign applications shall 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.

101707.25 4916 Rainier Ave. S. / Columbia City Theater
Columbia City Landmark District

Ms. Frestedt stated that at the applicant's request this application is deferred to a future meeting.

101707.26 Seattle First National Bank Building
566 Denny Way

Application: Proposed new business signage, to be attached through mortar joints or using existing penetrations.

Applicant Comment: Todd Peterson, representative of the owner, said they want to replace the existing Bank of America signs with Walgreens signs on the building and the tower, using as many of the existing penetration holes as possible. He said Walgreens also proposes to reactivate the drive-through for the pharmacy.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked the applicant to provide dimension for the sign on the tower. The applicant said he would put this on the drawings. The Board discussed how the signs should be placed on the tower and determined that 24" from the top and 6" (or one brick length) from either side would be appropriate.

Mr. Abelsen asked if they would replace the signage post or the fixtures. The applicant said if they decide to replace the fixtures they would change out only the internal mechanisms.

Ms. Sodt noted that the applicant will try to re-use attachments and fixtures if possible. She said approval was already given for the removal of the Bank of American signage (except for the medallion).

The Board agreed that the signage application was appropriate.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage. The tower signage will be placed at least 24” from the top of the sign and 6” from either the side of the tower.

MM/SC/MT/VA 7:0:0 Motion carried.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report because the proposed alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property, 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.

101707.27 Schooner Wawona

Staff Report: Karen Gordon, City Historic Preservation Officer, said this application in anticipation of moving the vessel to drydock where the applicant proposes to disassemble it; preserve selected vessel elements; to store and restore selected vessel elements; and to reassemble selected elements of vessel for on-land display and interpretation.

Applicant Comment: Joe Schickich, President of NW Seaports, reviewed the application and the history of the *Wawona*. He said it was constructed in 1897 and until 1913 served the lumber trade up and down the West Coast. Between 1914 and 1942 it was in the fishing fleet in the Bering Straight and its hold was continuously full of salt, perhaps one reason that it has been preserved so well. During WWII, it operated as a Navy barge carrying material to Boeing. Starting in 1947 until 1964, it had several owners and was on the verge of destruction when the Save the *Wawona* Group bought it. He said this vessel is included in the National Register, and is a City Landmark, as well as a Historic Navy Ship.

He said the *Wawona* has been used as a museum boat for the last twenty years. In 2005 they convened a summit to assess its condition and plans for the future. He said the summit reviewed several options from the ship ranging from abandoning it to doing a complete reconstruction. He said there is significant dry rot, there is a hole in the bow, structural deterioration in the frame. He said the Captain’s cabin and the poop deck are in good shape. He said they want to preserve knees and clamps because it is historic fabric. The Memorandum of Agreement states that the vessel will be moved to dry dock, disassembled with the help of engineers and the elements to be preserved moved to Magnuson Park and then returned to south Lake Union Park.

Mr. Schickich said the *Thayer* in San Francisco, is a sister-ship of the *Wawona*. He said it was completely reconstructed and less than 10% of the

remaining fabric is historic. He suggested that the dismantling and display of the *Wawona*, therefore retaining its historic fabric, would be a nice complement to the *Thayer*. He showed renderings of proposed locations in south Lake Union Park for the *Wawona*.

Mr. Schickich said it is possible that their plans for the *Wawona* may change, depending on the condition of the ship when they remove it from the water. He estimated that this entire process will cost \$2 million and the City has pledged \$400,000. He said they will need to raise the remaining amount of money.

Mr. Schickich stated that the vessel has been extensively documented in previous surveys, including the 1985 HABS/HAER Survey that produced detailed drawings.

Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked how they plan to lift the vessel out of the water.

Mr. Schickich said they will brace the vessel and lift it out of the water with a crane and probably disassembly it into segments and move it by barge to Magnuson Park. He said when they see its condition they will then decide how much of it can be saved.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the removal of sections would be based on the spacing of frames and if so, did this mean they would have to display the ship in pieces. Mr. Schickich said yes and added that one would be able to see the entire shape of the ship when displayed.

Ms. Gordon said the Board will receive briefings in the future as the process goes forward.

Mr. Veith asked if they would cut the planking. Mr. Schickich said they would discuss the best way to do this once it is in the dry dock. He said the dry dock will contract an historic shipwright.

Mr. Abelsen asked how they would protect the display from rainwater.

Mr. Schickich said there are several treatments they can use, depending on the condition of the ship.

Ms. Tremaine asked which pieces will definitely be thrown out because of their deteriorated condition.

Mr. Schickich stated that some of the decking is rotten, as is the port side and some beams.

Ms. Howard asked what they would do with pieces of the vessel that they find to be in good shape but don't intend to use in the display. He said they would offer them to other museums.

Ms. Tremaine asked if the masts are original. Mr. Schickich said no and stated that they have been replaced approximately every 10 years.

Ms. Tremaine asked if other original materials had been replaced. Mr. Schickich said the starboard side has been replaced, as well as some sails and rigging.

Mr. Veith noted that some public comment letters had suggested that more of the ship could be saved if it would be moved to a barge. Mr. Schickich said the experts at the 2005 Summit discussed this possibility but decided against it for the following reasons: 1) the cost was too high, 2) it would be difficult to buy and sink a barge, 3) the barge's integrity would become an issue over time, and 4) permanent mooring for the barge is scarce. He said he feels the dismantling and display of the *Wawona* would be an appropriate complement to the completely reconstructed sister-ship, *Thayer*.

Public Comment:

Matthew Moller said he lives on Lake Union on a wooden and historic vessel and understands the cost of having to replace parts of a ship. He said Northwest Seaport has done a great job developing the plan to save the *Wawona* and he said he hopes they can save as much historic fabric as possible and keep the community programs running, especially the ship shanty sings.

Alice Winship submitted a written comment letter. She said she assumes that her concerns will be addressed in the Section 106 process, which will determine what, if any, adverse effects there will be on the historic fabric of the vessel. She said she would be interested in working to mitigate any of these effects. She said she has collected signatures from people who wanted to keep the ship floating in the water, but she said she understands this is not feasible because of the high cost and perhaps "not responsible" since it is the only vessel of its kind left. She said it would be good to have it preserved on land and continue the community programming.

Kay Buillett said she thinks it is great that there is an agreement between the City and Northwest Seaport and she noted that the details about what features will be saved will be determined in the future. She encouraged the Board to approve the Certificate of Approval.

Larry Johnson said although he consulted with the Parks Department he would like to speak on his own behalf. He said it is sad that this vessel will be dismantled, but necessary.

John Chase said Seattle has significant maritime heritage, but there are not the funds to maintain this vessel. He thanked Northwest Seaport for undertaking the stewardship of the *Wawona*. He asked the Board to approve the application.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen stated that the issues raised in Ms. Winship's letter are very important.

Mr. Schwartz commended Northwest Seaport for their work and he said the application was "appropriate" and he supported it.

Ms. Howard agreed and said they should try and preserve as much historic fabric as possible.

Mr. Matthews noted that while the vessel's integrity is in doubt, Northwest Seaports' is not and that he trusted them and supports the application.

Mr. Veith said this application is going in the right direction and he said that he hopes that Northwest Seaport will preserve as much of the historic fabric as is possible. He expressed concern that only the skeleton may be left and urged them to save more of it. He suggested the final display not have too many openings.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed alterations.

MM/SC/VA/MT 7:0:0 Motion carried.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #106274 as the proposed work preserves and repairs historic features; and where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of an historic feature, the new feature shall match the visual qualities of the old feature, as per Standard #6 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The proposed changes are reasonable in light of the many alternatives considered by the applicant. The outcome of the *Wawona* Summit in December, 2005 identified the proposed change as the most reasonable alternative in terms of the vessel's condition and fundraising efforts to retain significant elements of the vessel.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

101707.3 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES

101707.31 Dearborn House
1117 Minor Avenue

Applicant Comment: John Chaney said Historic Seattle is ready to sign the agreement.

Staff Report: Ms. Sodt asked that Mr. Chaney send the signed agreement to the City and that the Board could act on it at the next meeting.

Action:

Moved to defer consideration of the Controls and Incentives Agreement until the November 7th meeting.

MM/SC/TV/MT 7:0:0 Motion carried.

101707.4 BOARD BUSINESS

101707.41 Rainier Cold Storage
6000 Airport Way S

Application: Briefing on proposed demolition of portions of the property.

Ms. Sodt reported that the ARC has been briefed three times on this project. She introduced Jim Harmon of Sabey Corporation, Steve Johnson, project architect and the project engineer Bryan Tokarczyk from KPFF.

Mr. Harmon presented site photographs. He said they plan on renovating the complex with the exception of the stock house, which they propose to demolish because of extension structural damage caused by the frozen and thawing ground underneath. He explained that this building was built in 1903 as a brewery and later operated as a cold storage facility from the 1930s until five years ago. Since then the ground, which they discovered was frozen, has started to thaw and cause the walls of the stock house to shift significantly.

Mr. Tokarczyk said they did a geotechnical report/survey of the ground beneath the northern end of the stock house. He said these soil samples revealed an ice ball beneath the building. He said when cracks developed in the un-reinforced masonry walls they applied crack monitors to monitor their movement. He said they are very concerned because air is now moving between the cracks now.

Mr. Tokarczyk said only one brick wythe of this wall is salvageable and the remaining 8-9 wythes do not have any structural integrity. He said the exterior skin of the west wall is made of good brick, but the interior layers are of poor quality. He said the wall is “waving” in and out, so only 50% of the bricks line up on top of each other and the bonding of the brick is deteriorating.

Mr. Lee asked how difficult it would be to apply an external brace to the wall, given that the wall is 5' from Airport Way.

Mr. Harmon said because only one wythe of the brick could be saved and even 50% of that is not sitting in the same plane, 70' into the air. He said they were not even sure if it is possible to rebuild the wall because of the poor alignment and mortar, but if it was, they would have to create an elaborate bracing system while they removed chunks of the wall and then shotcrete the wall.

Mr. Johnson added that if they were to brace and rebuild the wall, Airport Way would need to be shut down for a year during this construction. However he said if they demolished this wall, it would give them a lot of extra brick to use for repairs on the other buildings in the complex.

Ms. Tremaine asked if they had come up with any other options to preserve the wall.

Mr. Johnson said that in order to keep the brick in place during demolition and construction, it would have to be braced externally on the Airport Way side.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the condition of the lower tier of the wall.

Mr. Harmon said the lower tier of the wall was most damaged and their options consist of saving pieces of it or rebuild it with the same brick.

Mr. Lee asked if they could rebuild the lower tier of the wall.

Mr. Johnson said a partial preservation of the wall is possible but difficult because it has the same problems with the brick and sandstone base and has some "intrusions" from the 1930s. He said they conversed with the neighborhood about what they, the neighbors, find most important, but they are unable to find a site solution that retains the wall.

Mr. Lee said he would like to see more information about the remaining wall, as was provided for the Brew House wall.

Mr. Veith asked what cost estimate they have for bracing or rebuilding the wall.

Mr. Harmon said their estimates to preserve the wall would be approximately \$12 million and to rebuild it would be \$6 million.

Mr. Schwartz asked how they would plan on building a new structure on the ice ball. He asked if they would excavate it or use pilings. Mr. Harmon said they plan to brief the ARC soon regarding future plans for the site.

Mr. Johnson said the neighborhood meetings continue to keep everyone up to date on their plans.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00pm

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator