



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 550/07

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, December 19, 2007– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen
Mollie Tremaine
Marie Strong
Mark Hannum
Tom Veith
Christine Howard
Stephen Lee
Henry Matthews
Czarina Nicholas

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Elizabeth Chave
Rebecca Frestedt
Joanne Walby

Absent:

Ron Martinson
Alyce Conti

121907.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meetings of November 7, 2007

Moved to adopt the minutes as amended by Mr. Veith.
MM/SC/TV/VA 6:0:2 Mr. Lee and Ms. Strong abstained.

Minutes from November 14, 2007 meeting
Moved to defer consideration of minutes until the next meeting.

MM/SC/TV/CH 8:0:2 Ms. Strong and abstained.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

1219707.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

121907.21 Windham Apartments
420 Blanchard Street

Staff Report: Karen Gordon, City Preservation Officer gave the Staff Report. She said the rehabilitation period was between September 29, 2005 and September 28, 2007. The submitted rehabilitation costs are \$5,395,871.73 and the eligible rehabilitation costs are \$5,330,322.31. The disallowed costs, \$65,549.42 were costs incurred after September 28, 2007. She said the percentage value of rehabilitation is 133% and the work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

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

Action:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Windham Apartments, 420 Blanchard, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.
MM/SC/TV/MS 9:0:0 Motion carried.

121907.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

121907.31 4865 Rainier Avenue South
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Application: Proposed signage and associated lighting for Columbia City Bakery

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt presented the application on behalf of the business owner, Evan Andres. The proposed signage application is for the installation of a 3'6" w x 1'2" h aluminum flag mounted blade sign to be installed underneath the canopy. Colors will be matched to the existing signage above the canopy. The application includes a proposal to install two small incandescent directional lights (dimensions: 5.5" long x 2.5" wide) to illuminate the sign. Ms. Frestedt presented drawings and attachment details to the Board. The existing flag mounted sign, located above the canopy was reviewed and approved in November 2005. Identical directional lights were reviewed and approved for La Medusa, located next door, in 2005. She said

on December 14, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed signage and lighting.

Board Questions: A Board member asked where the lights would be pointed. Ms. Frestedt said the 2'6" lights would be on either side of the sign and would be concealed by the canopy.

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:

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines: 11. Signs, b. Blade Signs and g. Sign Lighting.

Relevant Code citations

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

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

121907.32 Ford Assembly Plant
1155 Valley St

Application: Installation of an automatic sliding door in an existing opening on the south elevation

Applicant Comment: Pedro Castro and Glenn Steiner of Magellan Architects presented the application. Mr. Castro said this proposed door is not visible from the street and they want to close it off to protect it from the rain.

Board Questions: There were no questions.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

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

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed installation of an automatic sliding door in an existing opening on the south elevation, based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #119114 because the proposed alteration 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 in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

121907.33

Smith Tower

506 Second Avenue

Proposed interior alterations

Applicant Comment: Mike Almon, Operating Partner for Smith Tower, reviewed the proposed changes previously presented to the ARC. He said today they are proposing changes to the elevator doors mechanism for safety reasons, as well as changes to the 32nd floor to facilitate the change in use from office to residential. He introduced Louisa Chang of NBBJ to present the application for Certificate of Approval.

Applicant Comment: Louisa Chang explained that they propose to change the elevator cab doors because the existing scissor-doors present a pinch hazard, especially since they will service the residential units “after hours” when the door attendants have gone home. She said they propose to install sliding glass doors with finishes and proportions that are compatible with the existing lobby-side doors. The door operating mechanism is concealed behind glass so the mechanism is still visible and accessible for maintenance purposes. She said they will also keep the lobby-side doors with decorative grill work that will be visible through the glass.

Questions:

Ms. Tremaine said she thought the applicants proposed to change the doors for only two elevators, per the Architectural Review Committee meeting.

Mr. Almon said they want to address after-hours use for the elevators that will serve the residential tower. He said they also propose to change the elevators that serve the office use floors because they want to attract tenants to this Class A office space who will expect to be able to get an elevator after hours quickly from either upper or lower elevator banks. He explained that currently, if tenants in the office spaces are working after hours they have to contact a security guard to arrange the elevator to be called up, which could take 10 minutes. He said the need to upgrade the elevators so they can compete with other Class A office space.

Mr. Veith asked why two elevators aren't enough to service the residential towers.

Mr. Almon said there are two elevators that are designated just for the residents and will by-pass the office levels. He said he doesn't know of any buildings where office and residential tenants share elevators for privacy and security reasons. He added that the Chinese Room will be available to the public and it wouldn't be appropriate for users of this room to use the same elevators that go to the residential floors.

Mr. Hannum asked about the proposed interior finishes on the elevators.

Ms. Chang said the finish inside the cab is polished copper and the lobby side is cast metal painted a gold color. She said they are actually proposing real brass for the new finishes, either polished or satin which will be sympathetic to the existing but won't replicate it.

Mr. Lee noted that the applicant said at ARC that they chose the color to match the finish on the scissor gate and not the cab.

Ms. Howard asked if these scissor gates are generally considered to be safety hazards by code.

Mr. Almon said they can be a safety hazard because someone could put their hand through the scissor gates while the elevator is in motion and seriously hurt themselves. The elevator operators have been on hand to discourage this but if the elevators are automated there won't be a person there to guard against this.

Mr. Lee asked if this was a change of use issue with the Department of Planning and Development. Mr. Almon said no.

Mr. Matthews asked that they confirm how many elevators they propose to change.

Mr. Almon said they don't know exactly but no more than five. He said they will probably change the residential bank elevators and at least two of the office use elevators. He added that they want to upgrade the elevator mechanics and may be required by code to add shaft walls or new buttons. He said they just want to make this change so the elevators can be automated and used after-hours.

Ms. Sodt noted that the application specified that they are requesting approval to change seven of the elevators and that an eighth is no longer functioning but is preserved with all original features.

Mr. Lee stated that the 32nd and 10th floors were also included designation along with the lobby area and restroom.

Ms. Sodt read from the ordinance which listed the designated areas: “...*the original intact floor plan on floors 10 and 32 to include doors, trim, wall covers and fixtures in corridor and public lavatories on each floor.*”

Applicant Comment:

Louise Chang said this is currently a multi-tenant office floor and they propose to change it to a single tenant residential use. Floor 32 will no longer be accessible by the public because it will be a private residence. She said the restroom is no longer feasible for a single tenant in its current condition. She explained that they want to have five-fixture bathroom systems, with stacked plumbing, but if they aren't able to reconfigure the 32nd floors' fixtures, it would cause problems in the plumbing. Also, by code they are required to add a second means of egress. She said they want to use as much of the available square footage as possible while retaining original features. She said the purple section on the plan denotes the areas they want to retain, including historic mosaic tiles, existing elevator hall lanterns, grille work and mail chutes. She presented a sample of the penny round tile they will use for the areas where they have to patch and fill. She said it is not a perfect match but the center pieces are very close. She said she will try to retain the marble wainscoting.

Mr. Almon said they want to keep the lobby numbering system throughout the building as well as the ceiling gridwork, windows and open floor plans.

Ms. Chang said these new units would likely be one bedroom and one bedroom plus den, with the bedrooms facing east. She said the bathrooms will have five fixtures because this is expected for a luxury residential unit. The living space will be along the west side to take advantage of the views. She said they want to “stack” the plumbing in the building and were they required to have a bathroom in another location it would impact the units above and below.

Mr. Veith said the interior perspective shows a door between the lobby and the unit but the floor plan does not. He asked if the tile is extended or not.

Ms. Chang said they are not sure whether the prospective buyers would prefer an entrance door or not; the drawing shows no front door with the mosaic floor ending at the purple zone.

Mr. Lee asked why the second exit isn't further from the other exit, rather than half the diagonal of the space.

Mr. Almon said they are working with a 2000 square foot floor plate and they negotiated with DPD whether they would need a compliant stairwell for a second means of egress. He said the single stairwell was approved during the 1999 renovations and they agreed to do a second non-compliant stairwell with exiting close to other exit. Mr. Almon stated that DPD has agreed to this floorplan and the non-compliant second means of egress.

Mr. Lee asked if this layout could potentially change.

Ms. Chang said they will limit the buyers' amount of modification but they will let them decide whether or not they have a front door, location of some closets, or perhaps a larger dining room instead of a study. She said the purple area on the drawing will remain regardless. She added that they also want to provide hardwood floors and in order to provide acoustic separation they will need the appropriate thickness for the flooring and substrate layers.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the door and wainscoting: he said it seems they propose to remove it.

Ms. Chang said they looked at other stair studies but said this proposal wouldn't allow them to add a spiral stair in the existing beam locations.

Mr. Abelsen said he wouldn't expect the door to be operable door but would hope they could keep the lobby enclosure and surrounding walls. He asked if this could be done.

Ms. Chang said it was not possible because they have a two-hour shaft assembly for this stair.

Applicant representative Mr. Bloom said this proposal would require a second wall to be put behind it but and the clearances are too tight.

Mr. Abelsen asked that they return with the proposed new penny tiles along with existing; he also that they study the shaft more so they can retain as much of this area as possible.

Mr. Lee asked if there is a beam through the stairs.

Ms. Chang said no, but it is close. She said the beams and girders are not shown on this map.

Ms. Hannum asked how this floor's entry and restrooms differ from floor ten.

Ms. Chang said this floor only has a single bathroom, but the marble wainscoting and floor finishes are the same. She said the sinks on floor 10 are

not original and it doesn't have any windows to the outside. Ms. Sodt pointed out that the bathrooms on these floor have two different floor plans.

Mr. Veith asked why they don't let two elevators service all of the office and residential spaces after hours. Mr. Almon said this would significantly increase the wait-time for elevators.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the wall that separates the vestibule and stair enclosure: he said it seems that the floor is cut-off in the drawing; he said that it appears that this floor could be kept intact.

Ms. Chang pointed out where they want to move the flooring and create a rubbish closet. She said the marble wainscoting would be retained on-site.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Tremaine said she was under the impression that only two elevators would be changed. She felt the elevators were important features of the building and she was not satisfied with this application.

Mr. Matthews said the safety issue is a real one and the owners are being responsible, but he suggested that two elevators be kept in their original condition. He noted that considerable alterations are proposed for the 32nd floor, but he supported the application.

Ms. Howard said she felt this change would alter the character of the building, but she understood the need because the change to a combination of office and residential use. She said she was still undecided.

Mr. Abelsen said he though the loss of the 32nd floor and the elevators would be unfortunate but perhaps necessary. He suggested an ARC review of the final proposal for changes to the 32nd floor lobby and hoped they would keep changes to the elevators to a minimum.

Ms. Nicholas said she felt the proposed changes to the 32nd floor were a drastic cut to the space and she did not support the application.

Ms. Strong asked whether the landmark designation ordinance would be modified now that the landmarked 32nd floor would become private property.

Mr. Lee said no, since they do, on occasion, designate interior features of private homes.

Mr. Veith said he could be convinced to approve the elevator changes for safety reasons, but felt the proposed changes to the 32nd floor lobby would not

be in keeping with the designating ordinance. He said the changes to the floor plan should be reviewed by the Board when it is decided, either by the building owner or the new buyer, what it will look like.

Mr. Hannum agreed.

Mr. Lee agreed that the change to the elevators may be appropriate because of the life/safety issue but said the ARC should review the final design changes for the 32nd floor. He didn't feel they could vote on this without seeing all the details.

Mr. Matthews said he approved of the changes to the elevators and 32nd floor that will enable the building to remain a vital office building.

Ms. Sodt recommended that the applicants return to ARC to review the 32nd floor details, and further discuss the elevators.

Mr. Lee asked the applicants whether they wanted to defer or have the Board vote on the application. The applicant decided to defer.

Action:

Moved to defer consideration of the Certificate of Approval application for the Smith Tower elevators and changes to the 32nd floor.

MM/SC/MH/TV 9:0:0

121907.6 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES

121907.62 Garfield High School
400 23rd Avenue

Ms. Chave reported that she received a letter from Fred Stevens, Director of Facilities for Seattle Schools requested a nine month continuance for consideration of the Controls and Incentives Agreement so they can complete construction before negotiations begin.

There was no Board Discussion.

Action:

To approve a nine month extension of consideration of the Controls and Incentives

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

121907.4 DESIGNATIONS

121907.41 Central Waterfront Piers
Piers 54, 55, 56, 57 and 59

Staff Report: On November 7, 2007, the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board voted to approve the nomination of the subject property and scheduled a public meeting to be held on December 19, 2007. The Board staff recommends designation of the following features or characteristics: For each of the subject piers, Piers 54, 55, 56, 57, and 59, the pier pilings from the west edge of the right-of-way of Alaskan Way (the seawall) to the outer harbor line, and from the north edge of the pier piling to the south edge of the piling, noting that Waterfront Park (Pier 58) is excluded; the exterior pier sheds; and the currently exposed interior ceilings and truss systems. The Board staff has also prepared the attached matrix for each pier that acknowledges certain features and uses that are not original or will require replacement. This recommendation is based upon satisfaction of the following designation standards of SMC 25.12.350 C, D and F.

Applicant Comment: Karin Link, architectural historian, presented the nomination report on behalf of the City. She said these piers retain much of their original architectural features and are prominent features on Alaskan Way and Downtown. She said the docks are associated with the development of downtown's economy, the transportation industry and international trade, as well as labor politics and the development of the Port of Seattle.

Ms. Link gave an overview of the development of what is now Alaskan Way in 1897 and how the piers were angled to in order to accommodate the loading and unloading of railroad cars on Railroad Avenue. She presented historic photographs of the piers and their architectural drawings. She noted that not all the trusses are the same but were built with heavy timbers, light framing and monitor roofs.

Pier 3 (now Pier 54) was built in 1891 and housed Galbraith and Bacon, a hay business operating at the turn of the century. In the 1940s this turned into a fish processing plant and later Ivar Haglin opened his aquarium and fish and chips stand. This pier was restored in 1983 by Baumgartner Associates. Over the years, the windows on the front have changed, some portions of Ivar's restaurant have been altered but the overall profile is the same.

Pier 4 (now Pier 55), which collapsed in 1901, was rebuilt in 1902 for Northern Pacific Railroad and was the gateway for shipping to Alaska. It was later remodeled in 1945 and 1985. She said a bay window had been added, along with the lower porch and chimney.

Pier 5 (now Pier 56), known as the Arlington Dock, was built in 1902 and housed the Frank Waterhouse Company, started by Frank Waterhouse, a Gold

Rush entrepreneur. It was renovated by Mithun Architects in 2000 at which time they added some hardiplank materials, but she noted this looks like real wood. The second level was also restored and the interior trusses exposed so it has a good sense of space. She said when Theodore Roosevelt visited Seattle he arrived at this pier on the steamer, *Spokane*.

Pier 6 (now pier 57) retains more original elements of its primary elevation than the others, although she noted that the double-hung windows added in 1935 and are still there.

Ms. Link noted that Pier 59 is already a landmark.

Board Questions: There were no questions.

Owner Comment: Bob Donegan and John Braden, representing Pier 54 and 59 respectively, said they agree these properties are historic. They pointed out that with the birds, wind and salt water they face unique challenges in keeping the piers open to the public. They said there are no publicly owned piers remaining on the waterfront. They asked for flexibility from the Board to allow them to make changes as necessary to keep the piers viable. Mr. Donegan said they spend approximately \$250,000 a year on pilings alone.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked how the lots over the water were determined. Mr. Donegan said the lots were platted in water during the turn of the century and the current owners lease parts of the areas from the Department of Natural Resources.

Mr. Braden said this was done based on the inner harbor line.

Ms. Sodt noted that the legal description will be included in the designation ordinance.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board members agreed that these piers are the essence of Seattle and obvious landmarks. They cited landmark criteria A, B, C, D and F and one board member stated that no where in the US can one see piers of this age that are open to the public. Mr. Lee noted that because of their scale and design they are obvious landmarks.

Ms. Sodt explained that the language in the staff report notes that some features are modern. She said these issues will be considered in the Controls and Incentives process but she suggested that Board may want to acknowledge it in the motion.

Mr. Abelsen asked whether it should be recognized that Pier 59 has undergone a major rehabilitation and that portions of it are new construction.

Mr. Veith said he felt this may not be necessary because the new construction is still part of the landmark structure.

Ms. Chave said any changes to this would still need Board approval.

Action

I move that the Board approve the designation of the Central Waterfront Piers, Piers 54, 55, 56, 57, and 59 as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation for each of the subject piers, Piers 54, 55, 56, 57, and 59 are the pier pilings from the west edge of the right-of-way of Alaskan Way (the seawall) to the outer harbor line, and from the north edge of the pier pilings to the south edge of the pilings, noting that Waterfront Park (Pier 58) is excluded; the exterior pier sheds; and the currently exposed interior ceilings and truss systems.

The Board recognizes the need to replace the pilings and decking and will consider that in the Controls & Incentives agreement to be negotiated between the Board staff and the owners.

The Board also recognizes that there are certain features and uses that are not original or will require replacement and are described below for each pier and will consider that in the Controls & Incentives agreement to be negotiated between the Board staff and the owners.

Pier 54: The modern addition on the south elevation.

Pier 55: The modern three-sided bay addition on the west elevation; and excluding the accessory docking facilities and associated building (known as Pier 55 ½) on the north and west side of Pier 55.

Pier 56: The modern projecting glazed addition on the south elevation; and excluding the existing parking area on west end of pier.

Pier 57: The modern projecting bay addition on west elevation, and the storefront bay addition on the eastern end of the south elevation; and excluding the existing parking area on west end of pier.

Pier 59: Excluding the existing parking area on west end of pier.”

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

Action:

I move that the Board recommend the repeal of Ordinance #121270, an ordinance imposing controls and incentives upon Pier 59, given that Pier 59 is included in the designation of the Central Waterfront Piers group.

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

Action:

I move that the Board recommend the repeal of the Waterfront Character Area Review, SMC 23.60.704.

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

Mark Hannum departed at 5:00pm

121907.5 NOMINATIONS

121907.51 John B. Allen School
6532 Phinney Avenue North

Staff Report: Staff recommends the nomination of the John B. Allen School at 6532 Phinney Ave N. based on the designation standards B, C and F. Staff recommends that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exteriors and interiors of the 1904 building and the 1918 building, the air raid siren structure, and the site excluding the sheds and play structures.

Applicant Comment: Ed Medeiros, Director of School in Phinney Neighborhood Association and Rhoda Laurence, Board member of Phinney Neighborhood Association, presented the nomination report.

Mr. Medeiros stated that this building operated as a school from 1904 to 1981 and now houses the Phinney Ridge Neighborhood Association, although the School District still owns the building. He said they want to preserve the use of the facilities and the site.

Rhoda Lawrence said there are two buildings, the first was built in 1904 and the second in 1918. The portables have been removed and the parking and play area remain and host a farmer's market meets in the summer. The 1904 building was designed by School District architect, James Stephens, in the Colonial Revival style. The interior of this building retains its original features from 1902, such as coat hooks with name plates and balustrades. The rooms remain intact except for some alterations to the office.

In 1918, the second structure was built in a fire-proof construction design that reflected the new school philosophy of the "border school". The cement plaster hall remains and the finishes are original. The classrooms, with wood

detailing, are in excellent shape and the bathrooms retain their marble and wood stalls. She noted that the former auditorium and home economics room were used as a cafeteria at times.

Ms. Lawrence said that James Stephens also designed Stevens Elementary, the Latona School, Wallingford Center, as well as Seward and Cooper schools. The brick school at Latona no longer exists. She noted that the 1953 air raid siren at the edge of the property remains and was structurally upgraded in 1956.

Ms. Lawrence presented a context photo to show the school's prominence in the neighborhood. She said it is much beloved in the neighborhood and the City.

Board Questions:

Ms. Tremaine asked if the brick school was built because the original building was not considered to be seismically sound.

Ms. Lawrence said yes. Seismic tests have shown that it could sustain damage in an earthquake. She said they are looking for funds to do seismic upgrades.

Public Comment: Christine Palmer said Historic Seattle would submit a letter in support of this nomination.

Char Eggleston, of Queen Anne Historical society, said this is a prominent building and she supported the nomination.

It was the consensus of the Board to support the nomination of the building

Action:

I move approval of the John B. Allen School at 6532 Phinney 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 exteriors and interiors of the 1904 building and the 1918 building, the air raid siren structure, and the site excluding the sheds and play structures; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for February 6, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MT/VA 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 5:55pm

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator