



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 642/08

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, December 3, 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

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Sarah Sodt
Karen Gordon
Melinda Bloom
Rebecca Frestedt

Absent:

Stephen Lee
Alyce Conti

Mr. Veith called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

120308.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of November 5, 2008
MM/SC/CH/MH

5:0:2 Minutes approved as amended. Ms. Tremaine and Mr. Peterfreund abstained.

120308.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

120308.21 507 Maynard Ave S
(International Special Review District)

Ms. Gordon explained the Special Tax Valuation program and gave the Staff Report. She said that the International Special Review District Board approved the C of A... She said the rehabilitation period is from October 2006 – 2008 and the work has been

done in conformance with the Certificate of Approval and met eligibility requirements.

Mr. Abelsen arrived at 3:38 p.m.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Certification: Hong Kong Building/Mar Hotel, 507-511 Maynard Avenue South. This action is based upon the criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; and based on the review and approval of the building exterior renovation by the International Special Review District Board; that the property is a contributing building located in the International Special Review District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the International Special Review District; that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the International Special Review District Board; and has substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application, and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Local Review Board as required by Title 84 RCW, Chapter 449.

MM/SC/MH/CH 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Abelsen abstained.

Mr. Veith turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Abelsen.

120308.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

120308.31 3815 S. Angeline St.
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed Final Design of a twelve (12) unit townhouse development, which will be divided into four detached triplexes. The proposal includes the removal of three trees on the property and the expansion of the rockery and landscaping on S. Angeline St. The Landmarks Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Approval for Demolition and Preliminary Design on June 4, 2008. This approval was subject to the Board's review and approval of all construction drawings, finishes and details necessary for Final Design. The Columbia City Review Committee received a briefing on the Final design proposal on July 11, 2008. On September 19, 2008 the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee reviewed the application. Three members of the Committee were present and gave a split recommendation – one member recommended approval and two members did not support approval on the basis of the proposal for vinyl windows. Since the CCRC review, the applicants have changed the proposed windows to aluminum clad wood windows. Exhibits included an arborist report, material specification sheets, preliminary Certificate of Approval, and east and west sets of drawings.

Applicant Comment:

Michael Hoffman and Carlos de la Torre from H+dIT Collaborative presented the project to the Board. The parcel line is down the center; the project is divided on that line into the East Phase and West Phase. The triplexes are separated on four pieces of property. Three trees will be removed none of which are significant; there are

methane issues in the ground in this area so they can't be saved. The majority of the landscaping will remain to help keep the street front character.

Mr. de la Torre pointed out how they broke up the massing from the street side, and how they used setbacks, materials, trims and garden windows to alleviate any starkness. The windows will be aluminum clad wood and colors were selected from historic palettes. They accented the buildings to be more playful and tie in with the Columbia City neighborhood and tried to integrate roof forms, slopes and entries to fit in with historic character providing a modern response to a traditional look.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the application is for final detailing and materials. She said the Board already approved the massing, siting, bulk, and scale.

Mr. de la Torre explained the existing rockery on S. Angeline would remain the same with penetrations made for steps leading to unit entries. They propose to landscape the alley side because it will be activated; they have located all parking and garage access in the center of the project. He said there is a 6' height difference on the alley and they will add rockery to tie in with the existing rockery to help assist with the height change. The rockery will go up 4-5'; SDOT will let them know if they need to go higher and if so they will have to go to stone pile if required by SDOT or zoning.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked if there were details on how they would join the existing rockery with the new.

Mr. de la Torre explained the rockeries would connect only at the inside corner.

Ms. Frestedt recommended Board consideration with rockery under current conditions; if the exception is not granted and they have to make changes they will come back to the Board for a revision.

Ms. Howard asked about the two different wall colors.

Mr. de la Torre explained one color scheme is for the alley facade and one is for street facade.

Ms. Frestedt stated this was in response to requests by CCRC to add variation so that it was not just one color scheme.

Mr. de la Torre provided samples of the proposed colors. He explained that an existing plum tree shown on the plan is to remain. The metal and glass railing at the balconies will have translucent glass for privacy.

In response to Board questions Mr. Hoffman explained that the glazing for the skylights will be a translucent material rather than clear. They will not be visible from the street but they may be visible from across and up the hill.

Mr. Veith asked about the shed roof on the bay and why it wasn't just made into a bay.

Mr. de la Torre explained it is both an interior and exterior element; according to DPD it is classified as a garden window. He said they were limited by the Code as to what they could do so they put in the largest garden windows they could. The 2nd floor windows are a little smaller as an architectural element and that size seemed more useful on the interior.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum explained the CCRC had gone back and forth with the applicant over proposed design and this iteration, while not ideal, meets CCRC guidelines and the board could live with it. He said he had a problem with the initial proposal for vinyl windows and requested they be changed to wood and the applicant has responded by changing to aluminum clad wood windows.

Mr. Matthews had no objections to the application.

Ms. Howard said it was an improvement over what they saw in June and it meets the guidelines.

Mr. Peterfreund stated the siting seemed awkward but it was a shallow grade so perhaps this is all that was possible. He acknowledged that the siting already received Board approval.

Ms. Strong said it was an improvement from what was seen before and supported approval of what was presented.

Mr. Veith agreed it was better than the first couple iterations, it meets the Guidelines specifically those mentioned in the motion. In addition to the material change to the window they now have a more traditional organization of the sash

Ms. Tremaine agreed with the Staff Report. She cited CCRC guideline #4 and expressed her concern about the compatibility of new construction within the District.

Mr. Abelsen stated Ms. Tremaine's comments were well-noted. He commented on the Board's earlier concerns with the proposed materials and noted that the applicant has made changes in response to those concerns.

Mr. Veith said there was weakness in the initial designs – which has not been completely dealt with – the building is complex for a small building and having this much façade complexity isn't a pattern in this District. He said designers should not focus less on trying to mimic traditional building elements, and more on designing a façade that works well with the District. He thought this was as close as they could get and supported the application.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed Final Design and Landscaping.

This action is based on the following Code citations and sections of the Columbia City Design Guidelines:

Columbia City Landmark District Ordinance

25.20.070 Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

CC Guidelines/Specific

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

13. New Construction

d. Facade Composition. Use a solid-to-void ratio, or window-to-wall ratio, that is similar to that which is found on historic buildings within the block and throughout the District. Façade design must provide visual interest (depth and relief) and avoid large unbroken surface areas.

ii. Residential

A. Windows and Doors

1. The relationship of width to height of windows and doors and their placement on the façade should reflect the same relationship found on other residential historic buildings within the District.

2. Window and door casing and trim should be designed with depth and visual relief.

e. Materials, Colors and Finishes. Materials commonly used on historic buildings in the District are preferred. Colors should be subdued and consistent with the historic buildings within the District.

ii. Residential

A. Building facades should be clad in stucco, brick, or wood clapboard, shiplap or shingle siding, or a combination thereof. Synthetic materials and faux wood graining are discouraged.

B. Wood and metal-clad windows are preferred. Vinyl windows are discouraged.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

MM/SC/TV/CH

8:0:0 Motion carried.

120308.32

5016 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City Landmark District)
Proposed exterior paint colors

Ms. Frestedt explained the request for exterior paint colors. Exhibits included photographs, drawings, and samples. She said the existing paint colors were applied without a Certificate of Approval. The LPB denied a Certificate of Approval for retroactive approval of the existing paint colors on October 1st, 2008. She said the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed a proposal for revised colors on

November 21, 2008 and recommended approval for one of three proposed color schemes.

Rebecca Frestedt presented on behalf of the applicant who had not yet arrived; she passed out color samples and colored renderings. She explained that the way the paint had been applied obscured architectural detailing specifically on the transom window area (which consist of painted plywood – no glazing). She said the CCRC reviewed and approved an alternative color scheme including the addition of a 3rd trim color. Ms. Frestedt proceeded to describe the existing building colors: body of the building is a sand/beige and is proposed to remain; the trim will be brown and will be at the panels at the base of the building and capping detailing at the top; and Drumbeat Red is proposed for the columns.

Ms. Chave explained that what used to be the windows had been painted a grayish taupe color.

Marvin Vanderhorst, applicant, arrived and answered Board questions. He explained he did not talk to a color analyst and chose the red because it seemed to blend with other colors on the street and chose red because of the brick. He said the color looked more maroon on the color sample and it turned out more red once applied.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Tremaine expressed concern about the brightness and preferred a more muted tone.

Mr. Veith echoed Ms. Tremaine's comments and added that the way the paint has been applied to the panels where the windows had been disguises the store front and creates a more monolithic looking building.

Ms. Strong agreed that the red is too bright and the difference of intensity takes away from the vision of a store front.

Mr. Peterfreund agreed; he liked the color on the paint sample but not how it came out on the building. He liked the darker trim.

Mr. Vanderhorst stated CCRC suggested option #3 of the options he had presented to the Committee.

Mr. Veith said the advantage of option #1 is that it gets the character; the infill is distinct from the overall frame of the building and makes the store front distinct from the frame.

Mr. Vanderhorst asked why the Bakery down the street had the red paint approved.

Ms. Frestedt explained it is similar to the darker red as shown on the paint chip.

Mr. Hannum said CCRC worked with applicant on the placement of the colors. He thought Scheme 1 gets closer to what the Committee had approved; he liked the addition of the 3rd color.

Mr. Matthews thought the current paint scheme is garish. He preferred Scheme 1 where the transoms are painted a dark color. He is slightly in favor of the former windows being a different color from the frames.

Ms. Howard preferred Scheme 1 and said the articulation through different accent colors helped a lot. She liked the red but preferred that it match the color on the sample.

Mr. Veith suggested a light version of the buff (the color of the building now).

Mr. Abelsen said most Board members seemed most in favor of Scheme 1 and recommended whoever did the motion to allow for one of the color schemes and direct applicant to CCRC for final approval of color.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for paint colors as shown on Scheme 1 subject to color of what were previously windows being approved by CCRC. This action is based on the following:

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

Relevant Code citations

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

Relevant guidelines

3. Building Surface Treatments. Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces.

Painted surfaces shall be:

- a. Repainted with the original historic color(s) of the building, provided that the business or property owner obtains a professional color analysis; or
- b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an "historic colors" palette that may be useful as a guide.

Secretary of the Interior Standards:

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

MM/SC/HM/MH

8:0:0 Motion carried.

120308.33

Fire Station #41

2416 34th Ave W

Proposed renovation and addition

Ms. Chave explained that this project has several reviews with the ARC.

Bob Hoshide, project Architect, explained the site issues and context; no change was proposed to the street side except for the doors. He said they proposed a 2000 square foot addition on the back side, some interior renovations, and re-stripping the parking lot. He said that two large and four small trees will be removed. He said they met with residents of the adjacent condo who requested mitigation for loss of trees. Two new trees and a “green screen” will be added near the property line. He said the “green screen” will be a wire mesh screen for evergreen clematis to grow up.

Ms. Tremaine left at 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Hoshide explained the main front elevation change. He said currently there are two sets of doors; the new design will change to one set of wider doors to accommodate a wider truck with a solid steel panel to fill in the rest. He said the existing doors will be reused on the interior: one on a storage closet and the other as a divider wall. He said both will be mounted but not altered. The addition will be two stories but will be the same height as the existing building. He said the bunk rooms and restrooms will be on the main floor and the basement, which will be consistent with the existing basement exterior. He said they will have new windows to match the windows on the existing building. (he said the windows had been changed in the 1980s). The exterior will be dark beige concrete with dark paint on the frame and bands. He said for the new addition they propose two types of metal siding: ribbed metal panel running horizontally and then a flat panel to go between the windows to respect the existing façade. The color proposed would be a darker color but not as dark as the trim. Mr. Hoshide showed existing and new proposed colors.

Board Questions:

Ms. Strong asked why they chose the solid infill panel rather than glass on the front elevation.

Mr. Hoshide explained there are seismic structural elements behind.

Mr. Abelsen asked what material they would use to protect the finish on the new door.

Mr. Hoshide explained it is a heavy expensive door and he is confident that it is good quality. It will have factory primer and will be painted here with a durable paint.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the transparent connector.

Mr. Hoshide explained the stair section serves as a gasket/divider between the new and old. He pointed out the deck off the beanery would be a simple steel structure with pipe rail to be painted dark charcoal. He explained the door has a knock out panel as if they knew someday they would expand so they put the opening right where that knock out panel was.

Mr. Veith was confused about where the deck is shown on the drawings. He asked how the corner works because there wasn't a return where the gasket is.

Mr. Hoshide explained they rounded the deck and railing on the outside corner. He said the detail of the corner is set back a bit.

Mr. Matthews noted the *Secretary of Interior Standards* discourages mimicking original structure and asked the applicant to explain how the small addition will look distinct from the original building.

Mr. Hoshide explained they will be similar in that the height of the roof matches adjacent original building; the pattern of the punched windows and the type of window. The wall surfacing/finish will make it distinct. It is a wood framed building, not concrete, with applied metal panels.

Mr. Veith mentioned detail 4 on Sheet A.73 seemed like a detail for a different condition on the other side of the building.

Mr. Hoshide will make sure the detail is corrected.

Mr. Abelsen noted because of the simpleness of the building design and the horizontal banding, the vertical elements play a significant role. He asked the applicant to explain how they relate to the building.

Mr. Hoshide explained there is a big overhanging lintel that runs over the top of the whole front façade. He said the trim on the sides are dark. He said it serves as a way to visually support the long thin element across the top.

Discussion ensued about the new door and fixed panel and the joint line. There was discussion about the two directions to consider: one is to have pattern of the windows in the fixed panel and play down the separation of the panels and have it read as one big opening.

Mr. Abelsen asked if changing the broader band to narrow vertical line would be acceptable.

Mr. Hoshide responded that structurally it has to be that big; as far as the door mechanism it is the way the door works.

Ms. Chave said the Board could act on the current proposal and the applicant can look at that issue and come back.

Ms. Strong suggested just painting the vertical structural post the same as the door color.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Matthews said it was a good small building and it is important to keep it operational. He said the way it is proposed still leaves the expanse to read exactly where it was before. He thought that the architects had made the right decision to

distinguish the structural post from the panels on either side by painting it a dark color.

Mr. Hoshide explained the existing building post is dark.

Ms. Howard was not disturbed by the dark post and didn't think it affected the symmetry of the building. She thought the proposal was very good specifically in the use of transparent corridors, new materials, reuse of doors; it echoes the rhythm of the original building.

Mr. Hannum agreed and thought the reuse of the doors on site was significant.

Ms. Strong said the applicant did a great job, especially in how they incorporated the new building.

Mr. Veith stated it was a nice job with the addition in the back and a good job of respecting the character of the existing building.

Mr. Abelsen concurred and said the project was fine, respectful of the building and admirable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed renovation and addition, and associated site alterations, as per the submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 122468 as the proposed renovation and addition, and associated site alterations, 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*.

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

MM/SC/HM/CH 6:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Peterfreund recused himself.

120308.34

John. B Allen School

6532 Phinney Ave. N

Installation of two interior walls in first floor hall of 1918 building

Ms. Chave explained the application and introduced Randy Sibley, project applicant, who would present the application to the Board.

Mr. Sibley explained that in the Community Hall (1918 building) two daycare centers operate in the main floor. One is leaving and another will be coming in. He said an insurance requirement necessitates making existing ½ height walls in the hallway space full height.

Ms. Chave interjected the refinishing would be considered in-kind.

Mr. Sibley stated they will repaint although the woodwork would be refinished as per daycare license requirements. The existing coat racks will be reused and existing glass front cabinets will be reused but they will put plexi-glass over the glass. They will remove the carpet and refinish the wood floors; concrete cement floor will be left as is.

Ms. Chave noted they are not removing historic fabric and the work is reversible.

Mr. Sibley explained he talked to Rhoda Lawrence (BOLA Architects) who advised putting in a 6 ¾" high cove base on the concrete floor. He said Ms. Lawrence recommended running molding across at the same height. He said the fire door will be replaced with a wood door and they will stain it.

Board Questions:

In response to Board questions, Mr. Sibley pointed out where the new walls would go.

Mr. Abelsen advised the corridor/hallway is significant to the historic character of the building and asked if the door could be left transparent above the doors.

Mr. Sibley explained the daycare wanted to use that area as a nap room. When use of a curtain or drape was suggested he expressed confusion about what he could do because there currently were no transoms or clerestories in the building. Responding to a question of whether or not a notch would be cut out of the trim he explained they would not; they will cut a notch in the sheetrock to go around the trim and will fir the framing out from the wall. The woodwork will be stained using Dailey's Gloss Stain; he provided a spec sheet. They add a little bit of stain and use it as a one coat finish – it has been a building standard there. Mr. Sibley said they propose a flush wood door at the non-common entry side, which is existing. All hardware will be kept similar. The new wall will be set back 2". The tenant will be a long term one; they hope to have the work completed for the January lease.

Mr. Abelsen expressed concern about the interior being blocked.

Ms. Chave said some elements could be referred to the ARC.

Discussion ensued about the location of the doorway and what would be allowed by Code. An existing wall added by the prior daycare will be removed. Plexiglass will be added to the cabinet fronts to cover glass panes.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen stated there were a number of unknown aspects related to DPD.

Mr. Hannum had no problem as long as the door frames will hold the plexiglass.

Mr. Matthews thought the door needed to move away from the stairway a bit but otherwise had no problem.

Ms. Howard agreed with Mr. Matthews.

Ms. Strong appreciated the sensitivity to the landmark and how the applicant has tried to come up with solutions; she had no problem with the proposed work.

Mr. Veith stated with respect to the doors some issues may come up and he thought the applicant may have to come back. He thought it was good that they were not interrupting the existing surfaces and trying to come up with a scheme that alters as little as possible with the building. He liked the refinishing work and the removing of the later added wall. He thought that putting a film on the glass might be an option over the plexiglass.

Mr. Abelsen thought the application was reasonable but the applicant will have to wait to hear back from DPD about what they can and can't do with the doors.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed installation of two interior walls in the first floor hall of the 1918 building, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report as the proposed alterations 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*. The proposed alterations are also reversible, as per Standard # 10 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/MS/CH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

120308.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

120308.41 Terminal Sales Annex
1931 Second Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Chave presented the letter requesting the 90 day extension,

Action: To approve an extension of 90 days.

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

120308.5 BOARD BUSINESS

120308.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator