



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 75/07

### MINUTES

#### Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

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

Room 4060

Wednesday, February 21, 2007– 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Mark Hannum  
Tehut Getahun  
Virginia Wilcox  
Stephen Lee  
Molly Tremaine  
Ron Martinson  
Vernon Abelsen  
John Schwartz

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Joanne Walby  
Rebecca Frestedt

#### Absent

Tom Veith  
Henry Matthews

Stephen Lee, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:38 pm.

#### **022107.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meeting of February 7, 2007

The consideration of the minutes was deferred.

#### **022107.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

022107.21 Bon Marche/Macy's  
300 Pine St.

Application: Proposed canopy lighting

Applicant Comment: Adele Ernst of Macy's presented the application. She said this application is a response to a request by the Downtown Seattle

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Association regarding public safety at the Metro bus stop on Third Avenue. She presented photos of the existing conditions and one with the proposed new lighting. She said the fixtures would be painted to closely match the existing canopy. The fixtures would be attached to each beam with four screws.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: Mr. Lee said that ARC reviewed this and recommended approval of the application.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed under-canopy lighting.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 114772 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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/TG/VW 7:0:0 Motion carried.

022107.22

4812 Rainier Ave. S.  
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Application: Signage and paint colors. Applicant is seeking retroactive approval for signage and exterior paint color changes to door and window trim.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt said on February 9, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the new signage and door and window trim paint color change.

Ms. Frestedt presented the application on behalf of the applicant. She said the applicant repainted to repair the chipped and deteriorating blue trim. She said the applicant selected the new color (brown) to match the trim on adjacent businesses. She said the new signage complements the blade sign that was previously approved.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Questions/Discussion: Mr. Hannum confirmed that the Columbia City Review Committee approved of the application.

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/Specific:

3. Building Surface Treatments. Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. Painted surfaces shall be:  
b) Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District.

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.

MM/SC/VW/VA 7:0:0 Motion carried.

022107.23

812 23<sup>rd</sup> Ave  
23<sup>rd</sup> Ave Group

Application: Proposed new residence on vacant lot

Ms. Chave said that at its February 16, 2007 meeting, the Board's Architectural Review Committee asked that the applicant show drawings that incorporate feedback that the ARC gave at its previous review of this project, including alternatives for the fenestration on the west elevation. She said the applicant was not present at the February 16 meeting. She said the ARC and Board staff also asked the applicant to bring the construction details for the entrance awning as well as actual color/material samples to the full board meeting.

Applicant Comment: Mark Haizlip, project architect, presented the application. Mr. Haizlip said this site is part of a row of landmarked houses (23<sup>rd</sup> Ave group) and the original house on his site was demolished by a previous owner in the 1980s. He said they propose to build a contemporary interpretation of the existing landmarked houses with similar setbacks and proportions, rather than mimicking setback and proportion. He said in order to have the same setback as the other houses they would need a variance from DPD's building codes. Also, on the south side, he said they are requesting a

variance for the 2' side setback on the south and a 12-13' setback on the north. He said this variance would be related to fire issues on the south side, where it could be treated as a party wall in a multi-family.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked why they need an easement in the rear lot.

Mr. Haizlip said an easement would allow them to provide parking since it is not designed as an alley. He noted that the first two units would need to sign off on this easement.

Mr. Lee asked why Mr. Haizlip chose this particular fenestration design on the street elevation. He asked if he had options to present today.

Mr. Haizlip said he does not have options to present. He said they want to keep the same rectilinear volume, proportion and height as the original house's design along with entrances on the north and south elevations. He said the proposed awning on the new house hints at the pitched roof of the other units.

Mr. Abelsen asked why the upper window in the new design is not narrow like the other houses and why the volume is larger than the existing buildings. He asked Mr. Haizlip to explain his design decisions.

Mr. Haizlip explained that the owners felt they need to increase the volume a little bit in order to sell the units. He said the entry way is wider in the new design because the other buildings' entries are unusually narrow. He clarified that the upper window size is actually the same as the other units, but the drawing needs to be corrected to reflect this. He said that the rear sections of the houses are all different.

Mr. Lee said the Board needs to have up-to-date drawings and that this discussion should have happened at ARC, had the applicant been present.

Ms. Chave asked Mr. Haizlip to provide the Board with a copy of the revised drawing showing the new window.

*John Schwartz arrived at 4:15pm*

Ms. Tremaine asked how the existing landmarks designation of this site would affect this new structure.

Ms. Chave said the owners would have to come before the Board to make any changes to the site, including a new building, because it will be built on a landmarked site. She noted that this is an unusual situation.

Ms. Tremaine asked for a existing review of the variances.

Mr. Lee explained that there is usually a 5' setback on the side of the building and a 20' setback on the front of the building. In this case, the applicant is requested variances for a 16' setback on the front and 2' on the side so the building will line up with the existing buildings.

Mr. Schwartz arrived at 4:10 pm.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

**Board Discussion:**

Mr. Lee suggested the applicant return to ARC so they can see the revised drawings and further discuss the requested variances before coming back to the Board for final approval. Mr. Lee said the Board can approve the front and side setbacks today in principal since it matches what was there before. He said the final design would be discussed at future meetings.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board defer consideration of the application for the design of the new house at 812 23<sup>rd</sup> Ave, subject to further review by the ARC of the design development and subject to future LPB review and approval

MM/SC/RM/MH 7:0:1 Mr. Schwartz abstained.

Action :

I move that the Board recommend approval to DPD of the front and side setbacks presented in the applicant proposal.

MM/SC/RM/MH 7:0:1 Mr. Schwartz abstained.

022107.24 Black Manufacturing Building  
1130 Rainier Ave S

Application: Proposed signage

Applicant Comment: Peter McAuliffe said that Darigold moved into this old space and proposes new signage and an awning on the north side of the building. He said they want to decrease the existing awning's size and re-shape it slightly He said signage would be attached to concrete walls and the rooftop signage will be in line with the parapet, as requested at the last ARC meeting. Mr. McAuliffe said he brought new drawings of the awning, as requested by ARC that show the awning below the sill.

Board Questions: Mr. Lee noted that the rooftop sign would not be attached to the actual roof structure.

Mr. McAuliffe confirmed this, but said that depending on the advice of their engineers it may need to be attached to the roof.

Mr. Lee noticed that the signage on the concrete wall is not under the Board's jurisdiction.

Mr. McAuliffe presented color samples for the signage.

Ms. Tremaine asked if the communication instruments on the roof were gone. The applicant said yes.

Ms. Wilcox asked about the canopy attachment details. The applicant said the canopy would be attached through the mortar joints. Me. Lee said this was reviewed and approved by ARC.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

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

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage.

This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 113601 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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/MT/TG 7:0:0 Motion carried.

022107.25 Ford Assembly Building/Shurgard  
1155 Valley St.

Application: Proposed exterior changes for Public Storage.

Ms. Chave said this application has been to ARC twice for these proposed storefront changes.

Applicant Comment: Steve Tange, Vice President of Real Estate for Shurgard, presented the application and reviewed the history of the project. He said the building was built in 1929 as a Ford Motor plant and has had various industrial uses before being converted to self-storage in 1995 with the top two floors being the Shurgard headquarters. Since merging with Public Storage,

he said these upper offices are no longer needed and they propose to turn the parking into additional storage spaces.

Glenn Steiner, project architect, from Magellan Architects, presented the report: the main entrance on the elevation for employees is no longer needed and the parking will be converted to storage spaces. He said they will cover the storefront openings and the garage door to match the existing materials. He showed on a rendering which openings would be closed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Questions:

Ms. Getahun asked where the sheet metal would be installed.

Mr. Steiner said it would go behind the mesh in the parking garage.

Board Discussion: Mr. Abelsen said this application was reviewed by ARC and they recommended approval. Other Board members said they felt this application is an improvement on what was there now.

Action:

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

The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #119114 because the proposed signage does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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/RM/VA                      7:0:0    Motion carried.

022107.26    Queen Anne High School  
215 Galer St.

Application: Proposed window/door alteration in 1986 building

Applicant Comment: Susan Upton of Johnson Architecture said the proposed changes are on the 1955 and 1986 additions. She said they want to replace the 30" windows with nano open walls, which would not be visible from the street. She said the finish will look the same as the rest of the building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

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

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed conversion of a window in the 1986 addition to a folding door system, and replacement of one door in the 1986 addition to a folding door system, 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 #112274 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/VA/TG 7:0:0 Motion carried.

### **022107.3 NOMINATION**

#### **022107.31 West Seattle Reservoir 8800 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW**

Staff Report: Staff does not recommend the nomination of the West Seattle Reservoir at 8800 8<sup>th</sup> Ave SW because staff believes it does not meet any of the landmark criteria. Ms. Chave noted that the West Seattle Reservoir was cited in the Historic Resources Survey. She said that a letter from Historic Seattle in favor of the nomination was received today and distributed to the Board.

Applicant Comment: Tara Wong-Esteban of SPU said that as part of the Mayor's initiative to secure the water supply, they are burying their open water reservoirs. She said other reservoirs, such as Lincoln Reservoir, have been through the nomination process. She introduced Susan Boyle of BOLA Architecture and Planning to present the nomination report.

Ms. Boyle said that the utilities have always been publicly owned and SPU's (formerly, the Water Department) growth began with the purchase of private springs on First Hill, followed by the acquisition of the Cedar Falls Reservoir, Bitter Lake and Lake Forest Park. She said the existing pump house at West Seattle Reservoir was built in 1931 and an art deco style addition was added in 1947. She said it is not unusual that the pump house is still in operation. She presented slide show featuring aerial views of the reservoir and the Kroll Maps of the neighborhood's development.

Ms. Boyle said that SPU had planned on building two reservoirs in this space but only built one. She said the construction photos look like this may have been a WPA project, although she does not have confirmation of this. She said this neighborhood near White Center has sparse development until after WWII when workers housing was constructed in the surrounding area of

Highland Park. She said the reservoir not strongly associated with neighborhood development. She noted that the other structures on the property are leased to FAA and are not included in the nomination. She said one of the new buildings is hypo-chloride treatment facilities. She added that liners were added to the reservoir in the mid-1990s to prevent leaks. The adjacent West Crest Park was designed by Richard Haag and built in 1974.

Ms. Boyle said the reservoir is not a prominent feature of the neighborhood and only the embankment and fencing is visible from the park. She said it is up to the Board to decide whether the reservoir's association with the growth of the water department is significant enough to warrant a landmark designation.

Public Comment: Christine Palmer of Historic Seattle submitted a letter in support of the nomination because Historic Seattle believes the reservoir's construction during the Depression was significant and contributed to the growth of West Seattle. She noted that this was not a very strongly association, however.

Board Discussion:

The majority of the Board members agreed that the reservoir did not meet the Landmark criteria.

Mr. Martinson commented that that although it could meet criterion C, it is not a strong enough association to warrant landmark designation.

Action:

"I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the West Seattle Reservoir as a Seattle Landmark, as per the reasons given in the Staff Report."  
MM/SC/MH/JS 7:0:0 Motion carried.

**020707.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Chave said they have advertised for the vacant Finance Position on the Board.

Moved to adjourn at 5:30 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator