



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 249/07

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, July 18, 2007– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Mark Hannum

Molly Tremaine

Ron Martinson

Henry Matthews

Christine Howard

Tom Veith

Alyce Conti

Stephen Lee

Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Sarah Sodt

Joanne Walby

Rebecca Frestedt

Absent

Vernon Abelsen

John Schwartz

Tehut Getahun

Stephen Lee, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

071807.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES Meetings of May 16 and June 6, 2007

Mr. Lee pointed out a word correction on page 6 of the June 6 meeting.

Action :

To approve the minutes of May 16 and June 6, 2007 as corrected.

MM/SC/MT/HM 4:0:2 Mss. Conti and Howard abstained.

071807.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

071807.21 Seattle Yacht Club
1807 E. Hamlin St.

Application: Proposed change to doors on second floor dormer

Applicant Comment: Mr. Steve Campbell, project architect with the Johnson Partnership, said the previously approved proposal didn't meet code because they had planned to add floor space and the building is in a single family zone. He said the door will be added to the existing walls and would replace three windows.

Mr. Matthews arrived at 3:35pm

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board determined that the proposal was appropriate.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed alterations to the second floor dormer, based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report because the proposed alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

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

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

071807.22 Storey House
260 Dorffel Dr E

Proposed landscaping plan. **Application postponed.**

Ms. Chave said the applicant had a scheduling conflict and requested that the application be postponed until at the August 1, 2007 Board meeting.

071307.23 U.S. Immigration Building
84 Union Street

Application: Proposed window alterations

Applicant Comment: Steve Yoon of Harbor Properties presented the application. He showed photographs of the existing window and sash which he said are in a deteriorated state. He said they hired Legacy Renovation to restore the window system. He presented a drawing of the proposed new window profile, which includes a second pane of glass that is 1/4" thicker than the original window. He said this would have a minimal impact on the profile. Per the ARC's request, he presented samples of the proposed clear insulated glass and the (tinted)low-E glass previously presented at the ARC.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Questions:

The Board members agreed that the clear insulated glass (sample #LPCS1) looked much better than the previously proposed Low-E glass.

Mr. Veith said the profile looked fine but he asked whether they would remove the stop and install the glass or would they rebuilt the top of the rail somehow.

Mr. Yoon said he did not have these details, but he said Legacy are experts and will maintain the profile.

Mr. Hannum asked if the frame and sash would remain.

Mr. Yoon said yes.

Mr. Veith commented that this change would probably cause the stop to move "in board", whereas typically the glass in a single paned window would be against an integral stop on the inside and have putty outside. Mr. Yoon said the thickness of the glass pane would be added on the inside.

Mr. Veith asked if the double paned units would be changed.

Mr. Yoon said yes, because they want to make all the windows uniform.

Mr. Lee suggested the applicant review the Secretary of the Interior Standard #6.

The Board agreed that the application met the guidelines.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed window alterations, based on the following:

The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 113990 because the proposed alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, and the proposed repair of the windows meets Standard #6 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation: where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*

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

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

071807.24 Seattle First National Bank Building
566 Denny Way

Application: Proposed alterations to site wall, and associated landscaping

Applicant Comment: Jim Bodoia of Mithun said he represents the building owner, BRE Properties. He said they plan on adding a mixed-use project on the remaining 2/3 of this block which will come up to the property line. He said the series of walls on the north end of the site and is important in relation to the sidewalk and the drive-through banking window. He said this will be rebuilt when the construction of the new garage has been completed on the north end of the site. He said the new garage wall would make this property line wall superfluous. He said they propose to remove the property line wall and rebuild the part of the wall that border the ramp. He said they would retain as much of the masonry as possible for future repairs to the main building and to rebuild a portion of the retaining wall. He said an existing cherry tree on the lot is in poor health and they propose to remove it because it may not survive if it is pruned in order to accommodate the new building. He said they propose to replant vine maples because they require a more narrow growing space. He said the ARC had recommended that they plant a cherry tree in a more open landscaping area and he said his landscape designer agreed to this.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith said he felt this application was acceptable. He noted that during ARC the applicant had said that the new building requires excavation that could undermine the brick fence and this is another reason why they wanted to remove it. He said it seemed like the fence is not functioning in its former role so its removal would not damage the site. Further, he said this proposal

will keep the bank building intact and provide a resource for bricks to make any masonry repairs in the future.

Mr. Matthews said the other brick walls are more important to the design than the one proposed to be removed. He said salvaging the bricks from this wall is a good idea since they would not be able to match the existing brick for repairs otherwise.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

The Board agreed the proposal is appropriate.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed alterations to the site wall, and associated landscaping, on the condition that the salvaged brick from the demolished wall will be used to repairs other brick features on the site, as needed. This action is based on the following:

The proposed work does not significantly affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report because the proposed alterations do not significantly 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*.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.
MM/SC/HM/MH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

071307.25 3715 S. Angeline St.
(Columbia City District)

Application: Revisions to final design of townhouses

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt said the LPB issued a Certificate of Approval for Final Design on July 5, 2006 (LPB 240/06). This project underwent extensive design review in 2005 and 2006. Ms. Frestedt said the property and plans were sold to Josh Beloff, Arc Development LLC, in the fall of 2006. After construction began, the new owners decided to reverse the floor plans on the first and second stories. Additionally, City Light raised concerns about the proximity of the previously approved balconies to electrical strikes. These changes triggered a series of exterior alterations. This application includes a request for retroactive approval for some of the alterations, as well as new proposed revisions to the exterior.

Ms. Frestedt said that the Columbia City Review Committee received project briefings on June 8, 2007 and June 22, 2007. On June 22, 2007, the Review Committee recommended approval of proposed alterations and revisions to the final design.

Ms. Frestedt summarized the proposed revisions to the final design of the 3715 S. Angeline townhouses (former location of the “Pink House”): she said the owner proposes to extend the walls on the north elevation under the 3rd floor cantilever. A 6’ x 6’ post will extend from the foundation to the 3rd floor cantilever to add structural enforcement and for framing purposes; The front gate and fence to the courtyard will be removed to improve the connection between the courtyard and the street;

Ms. Frestedt said the applicant proposes to relocate balconies on loft levels to the second story on the East and West buildings. She said they would reduce the size of the spiral staircase in the courtyard and alter the location of the stairwells for easier resident access.

Ms. Frestedt said the proposed fenestration revisions on the south elevation consist of the addition of egress windows on the second and loft levels and two 2’ x 2’ bathroom windows added for ventilation. In the courtyard elevation, she said the windows on second and third floors would be altered to mimic the window details for other units. She said a door and balcony on the second floor would be added. On the north elevation, the applicants propose to replace the previously approved loft-level windows with 3’x 4’ windows and replace the 3’x 3’ window on the first floor, closest to the court yard with a 6’x 3’ window. On the second floor a similar 3’x 4’ window closest to the court yard will be replaced with a 6’ balcony and double French doors.

Ms. Frestedt presented a packet of alterations prepared by the applicant with additional details.

Applicant Comment: Mr. Beloff said he had been unaware of the Landmark Preservation Board requirements and procedures when he purchased the property and decided to make alterations during construction. He explained that his design changes were intended to increase access to S. Angeline St. and enhance connections to the neighborhood. He said encroachment of the utilities lead to a reconfiguration of the balconies and windows on the north elevation. He added that the height of the spiral staircase in the courtyard would be reduced for easier accessibility.

Mr. Beloff acknowledged that the CCRC was disappointed that changes were made without approval, but he believes the CCRC accepted these changes in the end because they add value and re-connect the homes to the community.

Board Questions:

Mr. Lee asked if the materials shown in the photo of the west elevation are different than those that were approved. The applicant said the photo does not reflect the final design. He said he will use the approved siding materials (lap siding and Hardi-panel) and colors approved by the Board.

Mr. Beloff explained that he has proposed to move the balcony from the third to the second story because he was concerned that the balcony was not supported adequately and was too close to a high voltage wire.

Mr. Beloff said that he wanted to increase transparency between the building and the street on South Angeline. He said the CCRC suggested the removal of the courtyard wall and fence in order to keep the courtyard open to the street. He welcomed their suggestion.

Mr. Veith asked if the fence would remain on the west elevation.

Mr. Beloff said yes. He explained that he will pour the footing and place the fence on top of it. He said the rail detail will be approximately 4' high.

Mr. Veith recalled that the ARC had requested that the "cluttered" appearance on the west-facing facade be organized to be more consistent. He asked the applicant why the windows on the lower two floors were so small.

Mr. Beloff explained that these are the bathroom windows.

The Board discussed the location of these windows and vents and the use of frosted glass.

Mr. Hannum reported that the CCRC approved of the small windows since it did not consider this elevation to be as prominent as the Angeline St. façade.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board agreed that the proposal was acceptable.

Action:

To approve the application for changes to the application at 3715 S. Angeline per relevant code citations: SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and property, Guidelines – 13. New Construction – Residential, d. Façade Composition, ii. A. Windows and Doors

MM/SC/MH/MT 6:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Veith opposed.

071807.3 NOMINATION

071807.31 Packard Motor Company/Foley Sign Company Building
1205 E. Pine St.

Dan Ederer said he has been the owner of the property for the past 15 years. He introduced the developer, Maria Barrientos, of Barrientos LLC.

Ms. Barrientos said she has presented several projects before the Landmarks Board, including the Parkview Apartments, Allison Court and has served as an expert witness on the Treat House appeal hearings. She said she prefers to keep old buildings and she said she wants to save this one and add upper floors. She said they have submitted an Appendix A report to DPD. She submitted a letter of support from a community group. She said their DPD planner, Lisa Rutzick is in attendance today.

Susan Boyle and Sonja Sokol Furesz of BOLA Architecture presented the nomination report. Ms. Boyle said this L-shaped building was built in 1911 and is 32,000 square feet with three floors on a 140,000 square foot site. She said although it is named for Packard Motor Company, it was not built by Packard. She explained that Packard was slated to be the first tenants, but for some reason were not.

She showed the Kroll Maps from 1912-20 and 2001. She explained that Pike Street developed along the trolley line leading up from the Market. Auto dealers grew up during this time with small distribution centers and people would order cars out of catalogs. He said eventually the auto row along Westlake Avenue had showrooms for same-day purchase, as car culture slowly grew in the 1920, 30 and 40s.

Sonja Sokol Furesz said the architect was Charles Haynes, who came to Seattle possibly from Minnesota in 1907 and completed approximately 80 architectural projects before his death in 1940. His most notable projects were the Tyson's Oldsmobile Company Building (1912) and the Butterworth Mortuary (1923). He also built many single family houses in the Mt. Baker neighborhood. She said the originally building owner with Olaf Olsen who intended it to be a Packard Showroom, but then they did not move in and it was used as an auto-parts showroom. In 1979, Foley Sign Company purchased the building and has operated in it since, along with Sleep 101 on the ground floor retail space.

Ms. Sokol Furesz said the west façade has four bays with tall arched openings and there are two bays on the north side. The roof is flat with a two storey reinforced concrete frame. She said the storefront is no longer original, although its design is similar and the main entrance is still the second bay, its original location. She said there is a ramped auto entry on the north elevation

leading to the second floor. She said the showroom details are classical with small scroll work, a tiered baluster and coffered ceiling. She said the balcony is still original, but the offices have been moved to the edge as an infill. She also said the stairway had been straightened but the detailing is still original. She presented photographs of the second floor skylights and the parking areas in the basement.

Ms. Boyle noted that that an Environmental Impact Statement was prepared by Sound Transit and they identified nine “most notable” buildings in the Pike-Pine corridor that would be eligible for national and local registers, but this building was not included.

Ms. Boyle said this property may meet some of the criteria, based on a local association with auto row, and it may meet criterion D, if one were to consider its characteristics as “distinctive”. She said the architect designed other buildings, such as the Butterworth Building, that are higher quality and better designed. She said it is on the corner so it is visible, but she said its prominence may be subjective. She said it was identified in the 1975 survey as having significance at community level and is included in the City’s inventory.

Board Questions: Mr. Veith asked if this was the earliest auto showroom in Seattle.

Ms. Boyle said she did not know as they had not done a comprehensive study.

Ms. Howard asked if there are other auto showrooms in Seattle that have retained the interior detail elements.

Ms. Boyle said the Pacific McKay Building has some interior detailing that was included in the landmarks designation, but the Utrecht building, formerly an auto showroom, did not have much detailed features in the interior.

Public Comment: Char Eggleston, of the Queen Anne Historical Society, said that Maria Barrientos has worked on a lot of old buildings in her neighborhood and she liked her previous projects.

Mr. Lee stated that the Board is not going to take any proposed designs for this building into consideration during the nomination discussion.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews said he feels this building is significant as part of the early auto-row development and he supports the nomination.

Ms. Conti said she agrees that its association with the auto industry is significant and it could meet criteria C and F.

Mr. Hannum stated that although this building is charming he said he was not sure it meets the landmark criteria. However, he said he would support the nomination so the Board could determine whether it might be the first auto showroom in Seattle.

Ms. Tremaine said she did not support the nomination because although the building is interesting, it is not unique and not as distinctive as the Pacific McKay building or the building not nominated at 2030 8th Avenue.

Ms Howard said she would support the nomination so the Board would have an opportunity to learn more about the building's history and see the interior details.

Mr. Veith said this building could meet criterion C. He said the style and features were not distinctive and its prominence is probably based on its location on the corner. He said he would support the nomination so they could learn whether this building was a model for other auto dealerships.

Mr. Lee said he agreed with Ms. Tremaine. He said that to him it should be obvious that a building is a landmark. He said this one is not.

Action:

"I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Packard Motor Company/Foley Sign Company Building at 1205 E. Pine Street 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 of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for September 5, 2007; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle."

MM/SC/TV/MT 4:3:0 Motion carried. Messrs. Lee, Hannum and Ms. Tremaine opposed.

071807.4 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES

071807.41 Kobe Bell
Seattle Center

Action:

To approve the signed Controls and Incentives Agreement as presented.

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

071807.41 Horiuchi Mural
Seattle Center

Action:

To approve the signed Controls and Incentives Agreement as presented.
MM/SC/MH/HM 7:0:0 Motion carried.

071807.41 Seattle Center House
305 Harrison Street
Seattle Center

Action:

To approve the Controls and Incentives Agreement as presented.
MM/SC/MT/MH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

071807.5 BOARD BUSINESS

071807.51 Briefing on proposed changes to SMC 25.12 (Landmarks Ordinance)
Karen Gordon, City Historic Preservation Officer

Ms. Gordon said these revisions were proposed by City Council in order to standardize the land use proceedings for type 3, 4 and 5 appeals which are appeal-able to the City Council from the Hearing Examiner. She said because of their recent experience with the Treat House appeal, they decided to specify in the ordinance the Council's standards of review. She said the Board is welcome to discuss these proposed changes and decide whether or not to write a letter of support if they so choose.

Ms. Gordon said the first change to the ordinance is in SMCT 25.12.520. She said in instances where there is a failure of agreement on the Controls and Incentives agreement, that in addition to notifying the Hearing Examiner, the City Clerk will also be notified.

In SMC25.12.560 B, the following language is proposed: "*The Board's recommendation on proposed controls and incentives may be rejected or modified only if the Hearing Examiner finds the Board's recommendation is clearly erroneous.*" She explained that this will give the Hearing Examiner a standard to use rather than no standard.

Ms. Gordon said in SMC 25.12.670 "*accept, reject or modify*" was added to the statement about the Hearing Examiner's role related to the proposed controls and incentives. She said further down in this paragraph the phrase, "*recommending control related to population density*" has been deleted because that phrase was unclear as to its meaning. She said there were other minor wording changes that don't change the overall meaning. Another proposed change is to have the Hearing Examiner issue a decision within 15

days instead of 30 days and the appeal time is proposed to be 14 days, rather than 20. She said these measures will other standardize the procedures with other Type 4 and Type 5 decisions. She said that “other parties of record” will also be served with the Hearing Examiner decision.

In SMC 25.12.630 C *Procedures on appeal to Council, Standard of Review*, Ms. Gordon said the proposal was to add this language “*Unless some other standard review is specific by ordinance, statute or case law the Council will approve the Hearing Examiner’s decision setting forth recommendations unless the Council is left with the definite and firm conviction that the Hearing Examiner erred.*”

In SMC 25.12.640 *Council action on appeal*, Ms. Gordon said the following new language is proposed:

- 1) *If the Council affirms a Hearing Examiner recommendation specifying controls and incentives to be placed on a site, improvement or object, the Council shall enact a designating ordinance containing those controls and incentives;*
- 2) *If the Council modifies the controls and/or incentives based on its determination that the Hearing Examiner’s recommendation was erroneous, the designating ordinance shall contain the controls and incentives as modified by the Council; or*
- 3) *if the Council affirms the Hearing Examiner’s rejection of Board-recommended controls and incentives, or determines that the Hearing Examiner’s recommendation for controls and incentives was erroneous, the Council shall enact a designating ordinance without controls and incentives.*

Mr. Veith asked if this means the Council can modify the Hearing Examiner’s recommendation.

Ms. Gordon said they can but only if they determine the Hearing Examiner was “erroneous”.

Action:

The Board voted to write a letter of support for delivery to City Council.
MM/SC/TV/CH 7:0:0 Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator