



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 262/07

### MINUTES

#### Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, August 1, 2007– 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Mark Hannum

Molly Tremaine

Ron Martinson

Henry Matthews

Tom Veith

Stephen Lee

Tehut Getahun

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Joanne Walby

#### Absent

Vernon Abelsen

John Schwartz

Alyce Conti

Christine Howard

Stephen Lee, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

#### **080107.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meeting of June 20, 2007- Minutes were tabled until the next meeting.

#### **080107.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

080107.21 Decatur Building  
1521 6<sup>th</sup> Ave

Application: Proposed signage

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Applicant Comment: Randy Higgins of EDO in Portland, Oregon, said that Mario's has been located in Seattle since 1980. Mr. Higgins said he worked with a structural engineer on the sign design.

Mr. Higgins presented photographs of the building and surrounding area including a 1939 photograph showing a vertical blade sign. He said they had explored three types of signs: a marquee, vertical banner signs and a vertical blade sign. He said they chose the vertical blade sign because it has an "urban sense" that he said goes well with the terra cotta façade. He said the attachment would be through joints of the terra cotta. He said the sign design will fit well within the rectangular area between the columns. He said he will conceal the attachment details with a "screen."

Board Questions:

Mr. Matthews asked for more information on the attachment details.

Mr. Higgins said the thirteen  $\frac{3}{4}$ " bolts would be attached through the mortar joints.

Mr. Hannum asked where the original building sign was originally placed.

Mr. Higgins said it was bay over, where there is now a tree.

The Board questioned whether the attachment screws would be strong enough.

Mr. Martinson asked what the spacing would be between the attachment joints.

Mr. Higgins said 16" on center. He explained they were trying to use the largest screw possible to minimize penetrations.

Mr. Martinson agreed this was likely to be adequate. He said this proposal would probably be the most reasonable approach, except for the possible nicks in the terra cotta.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

The Board agreed that this was a reasonable proposal.

Mr. Veith said it is an elegant sign with nice detailing.

Action:

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

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #112275 because 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*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

080107.22 Doyle Building  
119 Pine Street

Applicant: Proposed exterior alterations

Applicant Comment: Grace Robinson of EHS Design said she would present the application on behalf of the building owner. She presented a 1937 photograph of the building. She said there have been few changes to the building except that the original east entry on Second Avenue had been replaced by a storefront added, and a new entrance had been added on the NE corner.

Ms. Robinson said they proposed to reinstate the Second Avenue entry and replace the NE corner entry with a storefront. She said they propose to remove an 8' section of the storefront, including some stone and existing storefront mullion. She said they would reuse the stone and mullions because they would be difficult to match and replace this storefront. She said the Eastside Glass Co. said they could reuse and restore the original mullions. She said they would also reuse the stone at the NE corner so it is flush on both sides. At the east entrance she said they would use material to match the aluminum storefront system because there is not enough stone.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the stone they would be reusing is the original stone, or stone used during the previous storefront replacement.

Ms. Robinson said that the stone was probably from the previous remodel. She said it is a close match.

Mr. Lee asked if the 8-9' wide Pine Street entrance could be widened another foot.

The applicant said yes, they could widen it to match the other entry.

The Board agreed this would be appropriate.

Mr. Lee asked for more information on the east entry where the new entry meets the existing storefront window.

The applicant said they would square-off the mullion to the floor level.

Mr. Lee suggested that they add a panel at the bottom of the storefront system that matches the height of the stone base.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said all the issues raised at the ARC meeting were addressed.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations with the addition of the a wider doorway on the Second Avenue entrance, as proposed by the owner, to match the Pine Street entrance; also noting that the detail at the base of the new storefront at the entry may use a larger section or panel to raise the base of the mullion to the same level as the base of top of the stone curve, based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #113987 because 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.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RV/RM

7:0:0 Motion carried.

080107.23

Storey House  
260 Dorffel Dr E

Applicant: Proposed landscaping plan

Applicant Comment: Misty Philbin, Landscape Architect, introduced Howard Miller of Johnson Architecture and said they would present the application. Ms. Philbin presented historic photographs of the house. She said the entry has not changed but that the carriage road appears not to be original as it was not in the historic photographs. She said they propose to remove the driveway and install a gate large enough to provide vehicular access if needed. She said their plan is “gentle” and they will use materials that have already been used in the existing landscape.

Ms. Philbin said they would like to widen the terrace at the back of the property. The historic pathway would not be changed. She said they propose to cut 2’ off one of the berms and level off the lawn and add a two foot granite wall to create a play area. She said the granite retaining wall would continue down the street. She said the remaining vegetation includes a huckleberry bush, a cedar tree, fruit trees and a very old lilac bush. Ms. Philbin presented drawings of the three proposed gates that will be added to the yard.

Ms. Philbin said the lighting scheme features downward facing soft lighting. She said no light sources would show. The lights on the path and stairway will be mushroom lights. She proposes to add some down-lighting from the birch trees in the form of tube lights.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked why the stairway was shown differently in the two drawings.

Ms. Philbin clarified that the stair design had changed and identified the current proposal.

Mr. Sodt said that ARC members had asked the applicant to attempt to determine whether the driveway was original.

Ms. Philbin said she did not think it was original because it was not shown in an historic photograph and that the woman’s dress seen in the photograph suggests the photograph is very old.

Mr. Veith suggested the photograph was taken before the site work was completed. He asked the applicant if they had looked at all the photographs at the archives.

Ms. Philbin said that as far as they know they looked at all the archive’s photos.

Ms. Philbon said that the garage used to be 6' lower than the Dorffel street and it was raised many years ago. She said she doubts it could have been a carriage house because of this significant grade change. She also said it is very difficult to fully remove a driveway, so a driveway could be put back in the same place.

Mr. Lee asked if the parking is allowed so close to the street.

Mr. Miller said this parking is "existing and non-conforming."

Ms. Philbin confirmed that the other parking spaces down the street are similar spaces that require the car to back out into the street.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Tremaine and Mr. Matthews said the plan is sympathetic to the house.

Mr. Lee commented that this landscape plan is very elegant and it reveals the architecture of the house.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed landscaping plan. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 106071 because the proposed alterations do not significantly alter historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

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

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

080107.24 Blessed Sacrament Church  
5041 9<sup>th</sup> Ave

*Stephen Lee recused himself as he is the project architect.*

Application: Proposed garage demolition and associated landscaping

Applicant Comment: Ms. Sodt presented the application. She explained that they propose to demolish the non-historic garage, which was built in 1960, and some associated landscaping in order to accommodate more parking. She pointed out on the plans where the new pathway and landscaping on either side of the entrance would be added.

Board Questions:

Ms. Getahun asked if the landscaping was a designated feature.

Ms. Sodt said the site was designated but that the landscaping was specified as a feature of significance.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

The Board agreed that the improvements were appropriate and met the guidelines.

Ms. Tremaine said she approved of the ivy removal and noted that it is a noxious weed.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed demolition of the non-historic garage and associated landscaping, based on the following:

1. The proposed work does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #109732 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*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RM/MT 6:0:1 Motion carried. Stephen Lee recused himself.

**080107.3 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES**

080107.31 L'Amourita Apartments  
2901-2917 Franklin Ave E

Action:

Moved to approve the Controls and Incentives agreement as presented.

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

**080107.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Sodt invited the Board to email any ideas for the Board retreat either her or Beth Chave.

*Meeting adjourned at 4:40 pm.*

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator