



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 26/07

### MINUTES

#### Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

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

Room 4060

Wednesday, January 17, 2007– 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Mark Hannum  
Henry Matthews  
Tom Veith  
Stephen Lee  
Molly Tremaine  
Ron Martinson  
Vernon Abelsen  
John Schwartz

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Joanne Walby  
Rebecca Frestedt

#### Absent

Tehut Getahun  
Virginia Wilcox

Stephen Lee, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

**011707.1**      **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**      Meeting of January 3, 2007  
No minutes were presented for Board consideration.

#### **011707.2**      **CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

011707.21      1001 Bellevue Place E  
(Harvard-Belmont District)  
Application: Proposed porch addition.

Staff Report: Ms. Chave noted that this application was reviewed by the Harvard Belmont Committee, and the Committee recommended approval. She said this house was built in 1986 on a lot that was originally part of a

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

larger property. She said the porch addition would not be visible from the street.

Applicant Comment: There was no comment.

Board Questions:

Ms. Tremaine inquired as to whether the porch would touch the carriage house.

Mr. Martinson, who attended the on-site Harvard-Belmont meeting, said it would not..

Mr. Matthews affirmed the Committee was satisfied that the porch would not be visible from the street.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: There was no additional Board discussion.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the proposed porch addition, as per the applicant's submittal. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed porch addition meet the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

C. 1.

Guideline: Additions should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is being preserved.

*The proposed porch is sympathetic to the existing house and will have little visibility from the street*

Guideline: The exterior material used for additions shall be similar to exterior materials used in the original building and should be finished in ways that are consistent with the original building.

The materials proposed for the new porch are consistent with the original building.

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

011707.22 Harvard and Highland Condominiums  
(Harvard-Belmont District)  
1155 Broadway Ave E.

Application: Proposed new landscaping, gate and fence for area of project within Harvard-Belmont District border.

Staff Report: Ms. Chave noted that the new condominium buildings only border the Harvard Belmont District(they are located on the site if the former Scottish Rite Temple) the right-of way is within the Harvard-Belmont District and is subject to Board review. She reported that the Harvard Belmont Review Committee said the landscaping, gate and fence were appropriate, but they suggested that the applicant consider an alternative for the wall/gateposts that included more brick.

Applicant Comment: Project architect Chris Davison with Meng architects said they are working with Bill Ames at SDOT for street tree retention but they will remove one tree because it is dead. He noted that a tree on Highland Drive may need to be removed in the future if they interfere with the power lines. He said in that case they would plant additional trees on this street. Regarding the brick perimeter fence, he said they proposed either a brick or concrete cap; he showed a series of possible designs. He noted that the fence was designed to “create a bridge” with the adjacent Harvard Belmont Historic District.

Ms. Chave asked that the applicant state a preference on the fence’s capping columns today so the Board can vote on it. She noted that they can return to ARC if the design/material of the wall or the caps change.

George Kropinski, owner of the building, said he prefers to have Concept Three on the plans approved today.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if there was an existing retaining wall along the west edge of the property.

Mr. Davidson said yes, but noted that it was not in the same location as the proposed fence. He said he might emulate elements of the existing wall.

Mr. Matthews stated that Harvard Belmont Architectural Committee viewed the existing wall and decided that none of it need be retained, but suggested the applicant use brick in the new wall.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the city arborist has looked at the trees.

Mr. Davidson said that SDOT has approved the removal of the one dead tree. He added that the power lines in this area will eventually be underground. In response to a Board members query about community involvement, the applicant said they have been through extensive community outreach during the Design Review and the MUP processes for the new condominiums.

*Mr. Abelsen arrived at 3:55 pm*

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: There was no further discussion.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the proposed new landscaping, gate and fence, with column capping concept #3, for area of the project within the Harvard-Belmont District border, as per the applicant's proposal, based on the following:

The proposed changes are addressed by the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

Guideline C 3 Landscaping:

- Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees
- The applicant is proposing the retention of the existing street trees

Guideline C 4: Fences and Walls:

- If fencing is required, low fences are encouraged especially in front yards to maintain the existing openness of the district.
- Fencing and wall materials shall be consistent with the district
- Planting is encouraged to soften the visual appearance of fencing and walls.

*The applicant is proposing an open metal fence along the sides of the property.*

*The proposed fencing material is consistent with the district.*

*Planting is proposed that will soften the visual appearance of the fencing.*

MM/SC/JS/MT          6:0:1   Mr. Abelsen abstained.

011707.23     1065 Summit Ave. E  
(Harvard-Belmont District)

Application for Preliminary Design for demolition of 1956 garage addition and replacement with new garage and addition; new landscaping including front courtyard and tree removal.

NOTE: This is an application for Preliminary Design and is subject to Board review and approval of all construction drawings, finishes and details necessary for a final Certificate of Approval. Street tree removal is subject to approval by the City Arborist.

Applicant Comment: Renee Roman, project architect with Leavengood Architects introduced the new owner of the house, Martha Wyckoff. She presented the landscape plan by their landscape architect, Karen Kiest. She said they want to remove the pine trees that line the street because they are growing into the power lines, leaning badly, and are not sympathetic to the District, in the opinion of Ms. Kiest. She said the house is a foursquare house with wood clapboard siding, a 1950s garage, and a steep back yard. She said they propose to remove and rebuilt a carriage house/garage on the north side of the lot. She said it will have a bedroom suite above the proposed new garage/carriage house. Also, in the main house a former ballroom will converted into a master bedroom. Ms. Roman said they would be asking for two variances related to setback and lot coverage. She said according to DPD's calculations 39% of the lot is covered by structures and exceeds the 35% limit. She said they are requesting the setback variance because the proposed setback is the same as the existing garage's setback. She said DPD also allows a property owner to calculate their allowed setback by calculating the average setback of the two adjacent properties, but she explained that in this case the adjacent properties happen to be setback more than is usual in the District. Ms. Roman asked for a variance because DPD's calculations include the back yard stairs, the deck and the new garage eaves. She explained that the stairs are necessary to access and maintain the steep backyard, and the new garage overhanging eaves are integral to the building design and rain water collection system. She said they plan on including a green roof which would decrease the lot coverage percentage to 32%, but according to the architects DPD does not include the square footage of a green roof their calculations. She said that their goal is to make the project as "green" and sustainable as possible.

Ms. Wyckoff said she wants to build a carriage house/garage that will incorporate "green" design in addition to having a more aesthetically pleasing garage. She said the existing garage is clearly not in keeping with the architecture of the house.

Board Questions:

The Board discussed the setback variance request and the lot coverage percentages.

Ms. Roman confirmed that the residential code does not include “green” incentives yet.

Mr. Veith noted that according to the District guidelines, “imitation in new construction is discouraged.” He added that it was ironic that the large overhanging eaves of the foursquare-designed garage put the proposed design over the lot coverage limit.

Ms. Roman said it will appear as new construction but will be compatible.

Ms. Chave noted that this guideline is often challenging since many homeowners want their garages to match the main house, rather than contrasting.

Public Comment: Thor Peterson of DPD said he has been working with the applicant and approves of the proposed design and believes the “green” construction elements dovetail nicely with Historic Preservation guidelines. He said the overhang eaves will protect the building from the weather.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews and Mr. Martinson said they were at the on-site Harvard-Belmont meeting said they felt the proposed garage design would be an improvement on what was there now (the existing garage).

Mr. Matthews said there is ample precedent in the District of homeowners building new garages that intentionally mimic the main house and he also pointed out that the construction details would make it clear that it is not original construction. Regarding the master bedroom addition to the main house, he said its impact is minimal because the main house makes such a strong impact, especially since this proposal will expose the northeast corner of the building and property.

Mr. Veith said he agreed that historic preservation is also “green” strategy. He reiterated his position that the guidelines strongly discourage “mimicking”. He said maybe if the dormers were eliminated on the new garage he would have less concern.

Mr. Schwartz said that he supports the project and that details will be addressed at the next phase.

Mr. Hannum said that he supports the dormers on the new garage. He said the proposal is more sympathetic than what is there now.

Mr. Tremaine pointed out that when the original house was built, there were no car garages, so the new construction of a garage should not be confused with a historic structure built at the turn of the century.

Mr. Abelsen said he is less concerned about the new garage than the new addition in back

Other Board members discussed whether they should approve this application for preliminary design review because while the design details can be reviewed at future meetings, the issue of the massing of the garage and addition must be voted on today. Some board members did not support the variance for lot coverage limits because the proposed design at once mimics historic construction and sets the proposal over DPD's lot coverage limit. Board members were divided on whether to approve of the massing of the proposal.

Mr. Lee said he felt this application should have been heard in ARC first, and recommended that it come to the ARC next.

Ms. Chave explained that the Harvard Belmont Review Committee serves as the review committee for Harvard-Belmont applicants, but that this is an unusual case because it is a large project with a preliminary design phase. She said as with Columbia City projects that are large or complicated, there can be a combined meeting with ARC.

Action:

"I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Preliminary Design for the proposed Preliminary Design for the demolition of 1956 garage addition and replacement with new garage; proposed addition and associated site alterations, as per the submitted plans for the project at 1065 Summit Ave E located within the Harvard Belmont District. This action is conditional upon Board review and approval of all construction drawings, finishes and details necessary for a final Certificate of Approval, including final landscaping, and street tree removal is subject to approval by the City Arborist. This motion assumes that future adjustment to the design of the two story addition to the main structure, the garage and the modified structure over the existing footprint including the green roof, and the adjustment of lot coverage may be necessary to receive final approval for this application. The Board recommends that the applicant pursue further

interaction with the Board through the ARC. This action is based on the following:

2. The proposed alterations and additions meet the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

C. 1.

Guideline: Additions should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is being preserved.

*The proposed demolition of the existing garage and the proposed additions may in their final form not change the character of the original house and are sympathetic to its design.*

C.2.

Guideline: The imitation of historic styles is strongly discouraged; new buildings should be compatible with older structures, especially in terms of other guidelines criteria, but they should also be a true product of the present, not a false product of the past.

The proposal meets the following Standard of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

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

MM/SC/TV/HM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

011707.24

Lions Club Building

4873 Rainier Ave. S.

(Columbia City Landmark District)

Application: Proposed new signage. Rebecca Frestedt, Columbia City Coordinator, said that the new signage will be modeled after the existing signage in form and size, but reflect the new name of the store, KC's Flowers. She said the lettering will be painted a darker green to match the awning. She said the applicant is also requesting the addition of a neon "Open" sign featuring a neon flower. She said that on January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed signage.

Applicant Comment: The applicant was not present.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum clarified that the Plexi-glass backing of the neon will be clear.

Ms. Frestedt said yes. Mr. Abelsen asked for clarification on the design of the canopy sign. She confirmed that the original sign and colors were previously approved by the Board.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: Board members asked why the applicant didn't take this opportunity to improve the sign design.

Mr. Hannum said he did not know why the applicants want to reuse the sign instead of designing something new, but that the CCRC has taken the approach that since the Board had previously approved the sign design and attachment, that the CCRC will respect the past decisions of the Board and allow the sign to be modified to include the new name of the business.

Action:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed alterations. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following section 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:

11. Signs. All signs on or hanging from buildings or windows, or applied to windows are subject to review and approval by the Review Committee and Board. Sign applications shall be evaluated according to the overall impact, size, shape texture, lettering style, method of attachment, color and lighting in relation to the use of the building, the building and street where the sign will be located, and the other signs and other buildings in the District.

h. Neon Signs. Neon may be permitted where judged appropriate on a case-by-case basis. Size, letter style, color, intensity and overall impact of the neon sign shall be evaluated for compatibility with the other signs and building in the District. Mass-produced neon signs are strongly discouraged. The number of allowable neon signs shall be limited to one for each 10 linear feet of business frontage or portion thereof.

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

**011707.3 NOMINATION**

011707.31 522 26<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.

Applicant Comment: Representative for the owner, Jon Ribary, introduced Sonja Sokol Furesz, preservation consultant from BOLA Architecture to present the nomination.

Ms. Sokol Furesz said this Queen Anne-style single family residence was built in 1900 and is located on a 90' x 120' lot between King and Lane streets in the Central District. She said the house features a front gable massing, a full-width front porch with lattice trim and an L-shaped back porch. She said the exterior is wood clad and trimmed, has a gable return and a frieze band. In the interiors, there are fir floors and trim and plaster walls and ceilings. Since construction she said the following alterations have been made: a southern bay was added, the porch lattice work was removed sometime before 1956, the asphalt siding was removed before 1983 and the kitchen has been remodeled in the 1970s. Also, she said the kitchen pantry may not be original. Outside, the two chimneys have been shortened but she said she found no evidence of fireplaces inside and some windows have been changed.

Ms. Sokol Furesz reviewed the landmark criteria and stated that she does not believe it meets any of the criteria, except a general association with the development of the Central District as an early residential neighborhood. She added that while it is an example of the Queen Anne style, she said it is not an outstanding example and has had many alterations. Also, she said she found in the records that the original owner, Mr. Marley, was a carpenter and may have built the house himself. Finally, she said it is not a prominent house because it is setback and screened by the landscaping.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked Ms. Sokol Furesz if the two open porches were unusual for the Queen Anne style. Ms. Sokol Furesz said she did not think two porches were unique for this style, but admitted she has not done an exhaustive study of this.

Public Comment: Christine Palmer, Preservation Advocate for Historic Seattle, said Historic Seattle did not oppose, nor did it support this application because the integrity of the historic fabric of the building has been compromised.

Ms. Chave stated that DPD received a letter in support of the nomination from Margaret Wilson, representing neighbors in the area, and Ms. Wilson expressed interest to our office in the nomination of the house. Ms. Chave said she contacted Ms. Wilson to notified her about today's hearing, but received no further communication from her.

Board Discussion:

Messrs. Hannum and Schwartz said that it did not rise to the level of landmark status.

Ms. Tremaine said it is a nice example of vernacular farmhouse, but it didn't meet any of the landmark criteria.

Mr. Abelsen said that it does not meet the landmarks standards.

Mr. Martinson agreed with Mr. Abelsen.

Mr. Veith said this house would be a nice addition to a historic district, but does not possess enough qualities to make it a landmark.

Mr. Lee agreed with Mr. Veith.

Action:

I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the 522 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue South as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not meet any of the designation standards of SMC 25.12.350.

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

**011707.4 BOARD BUSINESS** There was no additional Board Business.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator