



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 155/09

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, March 4, 2009 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen

Marie Strong

Tom Veith

Mollie Tremaine

Meredith Wirsching

Christine Howard

Mark Hannum

Mollie Tremaine

Alyce Conti

Steve Savage

Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Sarah Sodt

Karen Gordon

Melinda Bloom

Absent:

Stephen Lee

Sean Peterfreund

Vice Chair Vern Abelsen called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

030409.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of January 21, 2009

MM/SC/MS/CH

9:0:0 Minutes approved as amended.

030409.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

030409.21 814 E. Highland Drive
(Harvard-Belmont District)

Karen Gordon explained the Special Tax Valuation program and stated that this project met the required criteria. She presented the Staff Report.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: the Sam Hill Mansion at 814 E. Highland Drive, 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/MH/MS

9:0:0 Motion carried.

030409.22

Interurban Building
(Pioneer Square District)
157 Yesler Way

Ms. Gordon stated that this project met the required criteria. She gave the Staff Report.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Certification: the Interurban Building at 157 Yesler Way. 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 Pioneer Square Preservation Board; that the property is a contributing building located in the Pioneer Square Preservation District, and has not been altered in any way that adversely affects those features that identify its significance or contribution to the Pioneer Square Preservation District; that the property has been issued Certificates of Approval as required in the Pioneer Square Preservation District; 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/MW/CH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

030409.3

CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

030409.31

Wilsonian Apartments
4700-4720 University Way NE
Proposed barrier-free access walkway

Mr. Abelsen introduced the application and said ARC had reviewed the proposed changes.

Ms. Chave stated that the applicant didn't have samples or door details at ARC.

Brady Barkey, Ron Wright Architects, explained the proposal to create ADA access at the main entry. He directed the Board to a photo that showed the subject area. He said the existing entryway is 55' long at the a point he gestured to on the photo and said the proposal is to remove approximately 20' of that path to get the appropriate slope required by ADA up to the entry way which is about 12" up. He said they propose to remove one 6" riser at the existing entry, and then remove 20' of the

existing pavers. He said they will then replace this with a new concrete sloped walkway that hits the front entry porch and will put back the existing tiles and new tiles to match the existing tiles so that it will be a smooth graded entry slope to the top of the entry porch. He said they are not changing the look of the entry. He said associated with that will be a button for an automatic door for the first set of doors. He said currently there are aluminum store front doors that were put there in the 1950s. The aluminum extruded storefront that is in the existing wood frame which will remain. The doors will be an eight panel divided light doors to match existing opening. They will not be true divided light; they will purchase from a stock situation for economic reasons; true divided light would be too expensive.

Mr. Abelsen asked if they had any samples or photographs or manufacturers for the doors.

Mr. Barkey stated that the Pella door is specified in the packet but he didn't have a sample; he did have a sample of the color. He said the existing door frame is painted.

Jamey Holmes, owner's representative, stated they want to bring the building back to its original look. He said they did research and couldn't find photos of the existing doors. He said the opening is a non-standard size.

Mr. Barkey said the opening is approximately 5' across and they are getting 2'6" leaves. He didn't know how much more it would cost to get the true divided light doors.

Mr. Abelsen thought there was going to be a 3' leaf and a smaller one.

Mr. Barkey said in the original they said it was two 30" to match the existing.

Mr. Abelsen asked clarifying questions about where the opening device would be installed and expressed concern about blocking transom windows. He said the details are not shown in the drawings.

Mr. Barkey said they hadn't done the research and don't know which product they will be using. In response to another board member question he explained the doors open out and there are two sets of doors; this work will be on the exterior doors only on this application. The drawings show 10 lights and the correct detail is 8 divided lights on the door.

Mr. Abelsen stated it is important to clarify exactly what is being applied for.

Mr. Veith advised the applicant that he would need to submit a corrected set of drawings.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the replacement of the tiles and if any will be salvageable.

Mr. Barkey hoped to salvage some tiles but wouldn't know how many until they the work started.

Mr. Savage said the photo didn't seem to match the tile sample.

Mr. Barkey thought it was the photo color quality and that they are trying to get as close as possible. He said they need more material because there will be some destruction at the first step.

Mr. Savage asked if they had thought of slab jacking.

Mr. Barkey said they haven't talked about that.

Ms. Wirsching asked when the tile was put in and if it was original to the building.

Mr. Barkey thought it was original to the building; he said it has the "W" in it; the builder put a lot of extras into the building.

Ms. Strong asked how far the ramp would go out and if it would go out to the "W" in the tiles.

Mr. Holmes said they want to keep that as original as possible and are looking at just about 20' from the entry area to start the incline per ADA requirements. He explained the current doors are very heavy and are difficult for elderly and disabled residents to open.

Ms. Wirsching asked about the location of handrails is required by code.

Mr. Abelsen said the slope they are proposing doesn't require handrails. – Note: it is the applicant's responsibility to verify compliance with code, not the landmark's Board.

Mr. Barkey stated the transition would not be really noticeable.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen noted because there were inconsistencies in the application there was an opportunity to have some issues reviewed again at ARC after general agreement by the Board. He said, as Mr. Savage suggested, jacking up the slab was an option that could be considered. He said the Board has not seen an actual side by side comparison of existing tiles with the new ones so are not certain of what they have. He had questions about the automatic opener device and how it relates to the doors and transom light.

Mr. Veith said a detail is needed through the muntin grid or the divided lights; he wondered if it was the same scale and asked for detail on the entry sequence. He also suggested the applicant check on the price of true divided light door because it might not cost that much more especially if they are already buying a non-standard leaf size anyway.

Mr. Hannum said there are still details to work out and was more comfortable referring this to ARC before final recommendation is made. He wasn't sure how the operating mechanism would work if the doors are swinging out.

Mr. Veith said generally jacking the slab up or rebuilding it is reasonable to do; losing the step is not causing a critical change in the character of the building. The metal doors are fine but getting a door that looks more like what was originally there might be good but it is important to document what was there before trying to replicate it. He didn't know if true divided lights were original or not and said exact details are needed of what the applicant wants to do.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed barrier-free access walkway and new entry door, with the condition that the following items be submitted to and reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee: the closer detail, the tile color, and the actual door configuration including divided lights, and the option of using a jacked slab rather than removing and replacing the existing slab. These details need to be reviewed for final approval at ARC. 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 other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/TV/CH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

030409.4

NOMINATION

030409.41

Egan House
1500 Lakeview Boulevard East

Mark Blatter, Historic Seattle, introduced the nomination. He explained how the house was acquired by Historic Seattle and that the Parks Dept. owns the land underneath as part of a greenbelt acquisition. He said they made improvements to the building and rent it out as a single family residence. \$110,000 of "stability" and "livability" improvements were made. He said they installed a more permanent brace to what had been a cantilevered section of the building over the front entry, replaced the roof and much interior work respecting the original materials. He said Historic Seattle supports the nomination.

Susan Boyle presented the nomination (full report in file). She explained the mission of DoCoMoMo_WeWa which advocates an appreciation of modernism. She said DocoMomo_WeWA became aware of the house in 1999 and determined to nominate it. She said the house was built in 1958-59 and has been known for its geometric form and its contrast to its natural setting; it has received much press over the years. She went on to provide context of the site and how it fits into the greenbelt. She said the plans for the freeway were known at the time of construction. Eastlake was a blue collar and bohemian area and there were other modern houses put up in the area as well. She said that before the freeway there was a continuous neighborhood all the way down to Eastlake.

Ms. Boyle pointed out the strong geometry of the house. She said the deck was added in 1987 on the north side of the house and changes the triangular form and long broad horizontal piece. She said the elements are subdivided by the windows – tiny sliced vertical windows and more conventionally sized windows which are conventionally sized only when viewed from outside. She said the east façade has less evident character and is clad with a 1 x 5 wood siding. She said although the windows appear to be conventional, once inside the house, the windows are set for views when seated; when standing you can't use the windows to see out. She said Northwest Modernism has some strong principles, among them a close relationship to the site with patio doors and easy indoor-outdoor access courtyard types of buildings. She said this house, while it has a strong formal relationship with the site, is actually quite hermetic, and once inside it is not to have an experience with the outside. She said a lot of northwest regional houses have geometry that seems to be Scandinavian or Japanese influenced and instead here there is a flamboyance and dramatic shape.

Ms. Boyle explained the interior of the house is a wedge shape and the upper floors are stacked on top of the lower. She said the roof and ceiling are the same element and flair upwards. She said the stairs also pull one upwards. She said the plan drawings show the original floors with the entry and a small utility or study at the first floor, the kitchen, bathroom and bedroom on the 2nd floor and a single volume on the upper floor. By 1982 there had been changes: the deck on the north had been added, there was an extended balcony on the right hand side and changes on the first floor. There were changes to the bathroom which has been extended further in terms of functional space. The balcony on the right side – which was non original – has been removed. A skylight on the west end was added. Two skylights were added and roofing material providing a striped appearance has been restored.

Ms. Boyle said that when Historic Seattle acquired the house in 1999, it had a lot of damage to it. She said it was a wood framed house in a moist environment so much restoration was undertaken. She said the cantilever over the west side carport was reinforced with new steel columns and there was recent cladding restoration and deck replacement. She said the original Sears GE Kitchen (one unit including appliances) remains although some lower cabinets have been replaced.

Mr. Blatter said that the washer/dryer combo has been repaired and a dishwasher added.

Ms. Boyle said Reichert was a Modernist with an architectural degree from the University of Minnesota and a Masters degree from Harvard. He belonged to the Royal College of Organists in London. He worked for NBBJ in 1948 and then went off on his own firm in 1951. He played the organ and rode a Harley Davidson; she said he was very iconoclastic and idealist.

Ms. Boyle agreed with the Staff Report and supported nomination.

Board Questions:

In response to Board questions Ms. Boyle explained the cantilever replacement was due more to a structural problem than to weathering. The cladding was impacted by

the trees and dense vegetation; she hadn't heard of any damage to the house caused by trees.

Mr. Abelsen asked what influence Reichert has had on later architects because the cantilevered deck projection seems to be more of the 1980s and 1990s era of architectural design than of the 1950s.

Ms. Boyle said that "Falling Water" precedes this; it was the sensibility of the time. Reichert taught at the University of Washington on a temporary basis until the late 1970s and she wasn't aware of any students who followed him.

Mr. Veith said that Wendell Lovett has the same romantic tradition and thought he had his undergraduate degree at UW.

Ms. Boyle explained that Wendell Lovett taught there early so there might be an intersection between the two. The triangularity and shed roofs are much more landscape bound, naturalistic where Reichert's buildings are more flamboyant akin to some of Wendell's work.

Mr. Veith pointed out several phrases/terms in the nomination report that should be corrected.

Ms. Chave suggested that Mr. Veith mark up the report and send it to Ms. Boyle for correction.

Kathleen Conner, Parks Dept., said they have a good relationship with Historic Seattle with regard to this arrangement. She asked that the land not be included in nomination as it is part of a greenbelt and by their nature greenbelts are very rustic.

Ms. Boyle stated a precedent might be Golden Gardens Bathhouse.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Savage supported nomination based on D & E and thought it was distinctive and outstanding.

Ms. Wirsching supported nomination based on D & E and wondered if F might be a consideration due to the unique location and landscape.

Mmes. Howard, Conti, Strong and Mr. Hannum supported nomination based on D & E.

Ms. Tremaine supported nomination based on D & E and said it is an unusual house.

Mr. Veith supported nomination based on D & E. The house is distinctive of its style or period – both the pop and formal aspects, the formalism versus functionalism – and is a good fit for D. He was less certain about Criterion F because it is almost an accident of history that the surrounding area with the freeway Have made it more

visible. Because of the “zone of influence” of the structure he thought F should also be considered.

Mr. Abelsen supported nomination. He is curious to learn about what influence the architect had on others.

Action: I move approval of the Egan House at 1500 Lakeview Boulevard East for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the exterior and the interior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for April 15, 2009; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/MS/CH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

030409.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

030409.51 MGM Building
2331 Second Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a sixty day extension. She said the owner has been out of the country and needs more time.

Action: I move to grant the MGM Building at 2331 Second Avenue an extension of consideration of the Controls and Incentives for sixty days.

MM/SC/MT/CH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

030409.52 Terminal Sales Annex
1931 Second Avenue

Ms. Sodt introduced Marty Goodman, representative for the owner, and explained she had a signed Controls and Incentives agreement for the building. She said that administrative review was available for mechanical equipment.

Mr. Veith stated the agreement was clear about what would be expected.

Action: I move to approve the Controls and Incentives agreement for the Terminal Sales Annex at 1931 2nd Avenue.

MM/SC/TV/MT

9:0:0 Motion carried.

030409.53 Wilsonian Apartments
4700-4720 University Way NE

Jamey Holmes, owners’ representative requested an extension of six months to enable the Board of owners want to review what the agreement does for the Wilsonian and for the preservation of the building.

Ms. Chave said the Certificate of Approval and Controls and Incentives are two separate processes but having the Controls and Incentives complete is to benefit of an owner because some things for review can be eliminated.

Action: I move to approve an extension of consideration of the Controls and Incentives for the Wilsonian Apartments for a period of six months.

MM/SC/MT/CH

9:0:0 Motion carried.

030409.6 BOARD BUSINESS

030409.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sadt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator