



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 662/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, December 17, 2008 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen
Marie Strong
Alyce Conti
Henry Matthews
Tom Veith
Christine Howard
Mark Hannum
Mollie Tremaine
Sean Peterfreund
Stephen Lee
Alyce Conti

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Melinda Bloom

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

121708.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES Meeting of November 19, 2008

MM/SC/CH/MS 9:0:1 Approved as amended. Mr. Peterfreund abstained.

121708.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

121708.21 California Ave. Substation/Dakota Pl Park
4304 SW Dakota
Proposed site alterations and landscaping

Ms. Chave presented the application and stated it was basically a renewal of a previously issued (expired) Certificate of Approval with a small change.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Kelly Goold, DOPAR, provided an update on building work that has happened: abatement, site remediation, some structural work, brick repointing, and window replacement and are getting ready for site work. He said this includes work from two previous Certificates of Approval. He said the proposed railing is code required for safety. He explained that the proposed work that is linked to the renewal is the top of the plaza section of guard rail. The historic railing is being refurbished; the guard rail on top of the wall will be matched to the existing railing design with a 42” height guard rail that is on top of the concrete wall. He said the pointed pickets don’t extend up because it is a 42” high guard rail at plaza level.

Board members asked clarifying questions.

Mr. Goold said the safety rail is the change to the earlier Certificates of Approval and has been designed to match. He said the material will be match existing. He said there will be no modification to existing fence; it is interpreting the existing fence, rebuilding it in a new location as a guardrail without the spikes.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed continuation of proposed landscape and site alterations including the clarification of the guard at the raised portion of the site at the south end, as described in the application submittal and submitted plans. This action is based on the following:

- I. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the designation report because the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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 of SMC 25.12 .750 C and 25.12.750 D are not applicable.

MM/SC/VA/HM 9:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Hannum arrived at 4:46 p.m.

121708.22 Van Vorst Building
413-421 Boren Avenue N.
Proposed revisions to previously approved Final Design

Jack McCulloch presented the application and explained the building was designated eight years ago. The Board previously approved partial demolitions of the building, the remaining building fabric to be incorporated into a new development. He explained that the currently proposed plans modify the previously approved design in terms of access to the building. There will be no

modifications to the historic portions of the structure only to the new construction portions but need Board approval because the site was designated.

Janet Donelson provided the previously approved drawings, provided site context and explained the new construction. The glass curtain/art wall will face into an interior public plaza. They plan to make a pathway from the main thru-block corridor access into the Van Vorst Building addition more simple and straightforward. They propose one major stair rather than two. A pair of doors will be 3' wide to meet egress requirement. The brick façade remains; there are no alterations to it; they will revise location of doors.

Sarah Sodt explained that ARC reviewed this application.

Mr. Lee explained it is a minor change that is sympathetic to what was previously approved.

Ms. Conti stated it is a smart idea to go to a simpler entry with one stairway.

Public Comment: There was no public comment:

Board Questions:

Board members agreed the change was minor and that all changes affect only the new construction and do not affect the historic fabric.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed revisions to the Final design. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not significantly affect the features or characteristics specified in the Ordinance #12128 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.

MM/SC/HM/MS 10:0:0

121708.23

Seattle First National Bank Building

566 Denny Way

Proposed exterior alterations including window and door replacement

Ms. Chave introduced the application. She said that Walgreens recently purchased, and will occupy, the building. She summarized the current proposal. She said the request includes making changes to the north and south entrances.

She said there is a curved window wall; and recently all of the windows have been removed, without approval, and the applicants want to replace the windows with a close match to the original windows. She said that they want to removal the chimney and there are requested alterations to the drive-thru kiosk; addition of an overhead door on the west elevation and a rooftop mechanical room.

Mark Lahfdany, representative of the owner, went over the requested changes to the building: removal of chimney on top of former vault, keep drive-thru but with video-linked system, replace glazing in segmented window wall, and remove entry ways on north and south elevations and replace with new door, glazing and transom that he said would be identical to existing. The door hardware and the kick-panel in the lower part of the door would be different. At one time there was a medallion on the door; they don't have a representation of what that was so that will not be replaced. Instead of a 4" stile on the bottom of the door there will be an 11" stile. They would like to use clear glazing on the section below the transom on the doors with the green glass above. He provided drawings for Board review.

Mr. Veith said that he looked at another Seafirst National Bank building similar to this one , after the ARC discussion, and noted the doors had already been replaced; t inset within the clear bronze anodized original frame was clear windows but all other glass was uniform green including the two sidelights. He assumed that originally the front doors were also green.

In response to questions about the glass color Mr. Lahfdany said it was more a matter of congestion at the door; the green glass will get a reflection on it that might make it hard to see customers coming and going. He said the clear glass is less reflective and it is easier to see inside the building. Their prototypical store designed entries have clear glass below with tinted above; it is consistent with their store operation. He said in response to Board member questions he stated they are not applying for auto-opening doors unless required for ADA compliance. He said they haven't found one that sufficiently addresses the preservation concerns; for approval at this point they are submitting a replica of the original.

Mr. Lee asked if they would take the same approach with the glass (as they are with the doors).

Mr. Lahfdany stated the application for the bypassing doors would not make a significant difference in the appearance of the glass; they would not be able to argue in the future that the application would make the glass more or less offensive than it is now.

Ms. Chave advised that the Board has to act on the entire application but that the applicant could come back with an amendment if they have another solution.

Mr. Lahfdany clarified if they held fast to the request for clear glass at the door level at each entry the whole application could be accepted or rejected based on its whole.

Mr. Abelsen explained that it could, potentially. He said that the set that was handed out was dated November 12 and does not show the storefront.

Ms. Chave stated the drawings were the most current set she had.

There was general discussion on the drawings not being the most up to date and Ms. Chave asked the applicant to send drawings with the correct date on them so there is no confusion and added that she hadn't received them from the applicant yet.

The Board reviewed the drawings.

With regard to the drive-thru Mr. Abelsen asked if the whole kiosk or just a portion is being replaced.

Mr. Lahfdany said that the entire glazed section would be removed and replaced with a new frame with a video screen in it and a pneumatic tube adjacent to it.

Board members asked clarifying questions about the drive up unit – some said that it looked like the entire unit was taken out.

Mr. Lahfdany showed photos of what was currently there and said the insert would be removed and something similar would be put in its place with a screen in the center.

Board members determined it was not original so was a minor issue although the drawing showed the surround being replaced as well.

Mr. Lahfdany asked if there were a provision that applicant submit shop drawings to ARC.

Mr. Lee explained that sometimes it is necessary and explained that applicants have come back with detailed drawings and analysis of why they had to change windows. If there is an issue that can't be agreed on here, this Board can refer it to ARC. He explained that whether there can be clear glass in the doors and any door mechanism changes can come back to the ARC. He said the Board can do a blanket approval of the application with the understanding that any changes to this would have to come back to ARC and be part of the motion. If there is an issue with the clear glass, the Board could approve everything pending ARC approval of the glass below the transom.

Mr. Lahfdany wanted to add the drive up window to that so there wouldn't be confusion later.

Ms. Chave asked for shop drawings of the existing glazing system.

Mr. Lahfdany added that he would submit shop drawings and glazing samples for the two entries and the drive up window kiosk to ARC for conformance to make sure the construction intent meets the approval of the Board.

Mr. Lee stated the Board is glad the building is being used the way it is being used and it is not being modified to any great degree; from a useful conservation point of view it is great and the Board wants to be helpful.

Ms. Chave asked Mr. Lahfdany for updated drawing showing details.

Ms. Tremaine stated this was talked about at length at ARC and thought that the discussion was whether it would be a blue-green bottle glass or the green glass and also about the reflection of the clear glass. She thought the glass could always be changed out so it should be approved.

Mr. Veith stated the green is characteristic of the design of the building and it would be good to maintain it. He recommended the color should be consistent throughout the building.

Mr. Abelsen stated the applicant provided details of the extruded aluminum but it is not complete in that it address on section but does not address the vertical mullion that is proud of the horizontal which is shown in the photograph. He wanted to make sure the assembly that is being proposed will be consistent.

Mr. Lahfdany assured they are all flush although the drawing looks otherwise. He said that no matter what they do in construction the doors and sidelights will be vandalized; it is the nature of the neighborhood. Walgreen's will put diamond plate skins on the glass.

Ms. Chave stated the armorcoat (security film) treatment was part of the application.

Mr. Lahfdany said they will only armorcoat in the reach zone down – from 7' down. Even if it is green and green, the greens won't be consistent. The armor coat changes the density and the way the light goes through the glass; it has a silvering affect and refracts the light differently.

Mr. Veith thought that level of change is acceptable to see some of the green glass with a coating and thought it would be less jarring than seeing green glass and clear glass. He said the green glass was popular in the 1950s and is part of

the design; it would still be there if not for the mistake (the removal of the windows by the contractor).

Ms. Conti agreed with Mr. Veith.

Mr. Matthews spoke to the applicant's presentation of the clear glass as a safety issue and asked what research has been done that suggests it is necessary to have clear glass.

Mr. Lee stated the Board must decide if it wants to approve this project as presented with all green tinted glass with doors as presented, and if the applicants have reason to come back for changes, they can come back.

Ms. Chave advised the detailing is needed for the C of A.

There was Board consensus that the Board would vote on this project with all green tinted glass, and with the understanding that the kiosk design surround doesn't change, just the machinery.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations including:

Replacement of north and south entry doors and storefronts utilizing green glass

Replacement of east elevation windows utilizing the green glass

Alterations to equipment at drive-through kiosk but no change to the masonry surround

Addition of overhead door on west elevation

Removal of chimney at northwest corner

New rooftop mechanical equipment

This action is based on the following:

1. The Board considered the applicability of the following Standard of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation: Standard # 6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical or pictorial evidence.*

The applicant has provided an analysis on the windows and doors proposed for replacement, and presented alternatives for the proposed replacement of the doors. The design of the replacement windows and doors is compatible with the landmark building and closely matches the profile of the original windows.

2. The other items included in the applicant's 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*.

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

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

Ms. Chave reminded Mr. Lahfdany she needs three more correct sets of drawings for the Certificate of Approval.

121708.3 NOMINATION

121708.31 William Tell Apartments
2327 Second Avenue

Postponed.

121708.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

121708.41 Dr. Annie Russell House
5721 8th Ave NE

Ms. Chave presented the request for an extension.

Action: I move that the Board extend consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Dr. Annie Russell House for a period of one month.

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

121708.42 Eitel Building
1501 Second Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt presented the request for an extension.

Action: I move that the Board extend consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Eitel Building for a period of sixty days.

MM/SC/TV/MS 10:0:0 Motion carried.

121708.43 MGM Building
2331 Second Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt presented the request for an extension.

Action: I move that the Board extend consideration of Controls and Incentives for the MGM Building for a period of sixty days.

MM/SC/TV/VA 10:0:0 Motion carried.

121708.5 BOARD BREIFING

121708.51 Pacific McKay and Ford McKay Buildings
601-615 Westlake Ave N
Briefing on proposal for both buildings

Postponed.

121708.6 BOARD BUSINESS

121708.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator