



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 133/07

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, April 18, 2007– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

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

Staff

Elizabeth Chave
Rebecca Frestedt
Joanne Walby

Absent

Tehut Getahun

Stephen Lee, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.

041807.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of March 21, 2007

Mr. Veith corrected some language in the discussion of paint colors.

Moved to approve the minutes as amended.

MM/SC/VW/MT 7:0:1 Minutes adopted. *Mark Hannum recused.*

041807.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

041807.21 4857-4959 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Application: New paint colors for the building exterior and new signage for 4857 Rainier Ave. S.

Ms. Frestedt presented the application on behalf of the applicant. She said this application includes a request for paint color changes to the exterior trim, including the door trim, clearstory windows and canopy at 4857-4859 Rainier Ave. S, home to La Medusa and Retroactive Kids. She said the applicant proposes to paint the canopy and gutter “Caldwell Green” and the door and window trim “Branchport Brown. She said the owners of Retroactive Kids/Westside Kids Salon, at 4859 Rainier Ave, are proposing to repaint the former “Neighborhood Service Center” sign with new colors and store logos. The 5’ x 18” sign is made of wood. The sign will be attached using the existing hardware, suspended from the canopy.

Ms. Frestedt said the background of the sign will be grey. The colors of the Retroactive Kids logo are Apple 5 and Deep Pink 4. The badge on the Westside Kids Salon logo will be painted blue and feature black lettering on a white background inside the badge. She said on April 13th, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed paint colors and signage.

Board Questions: Mr. Lee asked if there would be any lighting.

Ms. Frestedt said there was none proposed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board agreed the application was clear and in compliance with the guidelines.

Action:

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

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines #3 Building Surface Treatments and #11 Signs and SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property.

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

041807.22

Columbia Park
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Application: Centennial tree planting and commemorative plaque installation.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt presented the application on behalf of the applicant. She stated that the applicant proposes to plant a tree (Bigleaf Maple – 2” to 4” caliper) in one of two alternative locations near the Columbia Branch Library. Option 1: Located east of the existing three Bigleaf Maples, approximately 8’ from the sidewalk, or Option 2: Located west of the library, between the main part of the Library and the sidewalk (if the Parks Department discovers conditions that prevent planting in location Option 1).

Ms. Frestedt the application includes a proposal to place a plaque near the base of the tree. The plaque is cast bronze, dimensions – 10” wide x 7.5” high. It has a brown pebble textured finish with a raised single line border. The plaque will be set in concrete and placed beneath the tree flush with the grass. See examples of the tree and plaque in the attached photographs. The plaque reads: *“This commemorative centennial tree was planted to celebrate the annexation of Columbia City to the City of Seattle on May 3, 1907 Mayor Greg Nickels May 3, 2007.”* She said on April 13th, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the landscaping and plaque design for location Option 1.

Applicant Comment: Kathleen Conner of the City of Seattle Parks Department stated that she approves of Option 1. She said the Big Leaf Maples would grow into a nice arc. She said they chose to plant more than one tree in case it dies out. She added that the plaque is one of six such plaques to be installed citywide.

Board Questions:

Ms. Wilcox asked what the trees’ life span is.

Ms. Conner said they could last 20 years or more.

Mr. Veith asked if the spacing of the trees would be the same as the existing trees.

Ms. Conner said yes and added that it would take about eight years to reach the full-grown canopy size.

Ms. Frestedt reported that the CCRC approved Option 1 with a 10’ spacing adjustment if needed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board members agreed that the plaque and siting of the trees were appropriate.

Action:

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

The proposed alterations meet the following section of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines #7 Landscaping and #11 Signs and SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property, MM/SC/MH/RM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

041807.23 908 Summit Ave. E
(Harvard-Belmont District)

Application: Proposed new garage; exterior alterations to house including two skylights and a new chimney.

Staff Report: Ms. Chave reported that the Harvard Belmont Review Committee reviewed the project on-site and determined that it conforms with the District Guidelines. She added that the previous owners of this house had proposed to demolish it but that request was denied by the Landmarks Board. She said the current owner/applicant, Ray Studebaker, is also requesting retroactive approval for the skylights and for the relocation of the chimney. She said other planned changes are not visible from the street and therefore, are not under the Board's purview. She noted that parking has been a problem in this neighborhood and is noted in the Harvard Belmont guidelines.

Applicant Comment: Mr. Studebaker noted that he cannot fit a garage into his back yard, so having it in the front yard is his only option. He explained the project.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked if there were other garages of this type.

Mr. Studebaker confirmed that there are other "bunker-type" garages on this and the surrounding streets.

Mr. Lee said this Board should be consistent with previous Board decisions.

Ms. Chave noted that the applicant has no other location to place a garage.

Mr. Lee asked why the proposed garage would be so close to the property line.

Mr. Studebaker said the zoning language allows bunker garages in single family houses.

Mr. Veith asked if there have been any studies done to show how much of the house would be blocked by a garage.

Mr. Studebaker said that the height of the deck correspondences with the height at the front porch. He said the house is setback 40' and 10' above the sidewalk.

Mr. Veith said the garage is approximately 1.5 times higher than the retaining wall and could block the porch.

Mr. Studebaker said his proposed design is not different from other bunker garages.

Ms. Chave noted that the view from across the street is farther away than on most streets because there is a triangle-shaped planting that extends the width of the street.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the proposed railing is new.

Mr. Studebaker confirmed that it is new and that he chose a design similar to what had been there before. He said the railing was required by code.

Mr. Abelsen asked why the chimney was relocated.

Mr. Studebaker said it had been on a ridgeline and he moved to the living room. He said he re-used the old brick from the relocated chimney.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Martinson commented that one skylight is visible from across the street and the proposed garage is twice as high as the existing wall.

Mr. Lee noted that garages are common in this neighborhood.

Ms. Tremaine agreed.

Mr. Matthews said he was not enthusiastic about the application, but felt the style was appropriate.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the scored pattern on the exposed concrete should be extended to the new addition.

Mr. Martinson noted that the Harvard Belmont Review Committee did not believe this pattern was original to the concrete wall.

Mr. Veith noted that the top of the railing was 2.25 times taller than the retaining wall. He said although the view of the porch would be lost, the garage design is in keeping with the garage designs in the neighborhood.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the proposed new garage, and exterior alterations to house including two skylights and new chimney, 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.

MM/SC/RM/VW 9:0:0 Motion carried.

041807.24 Wallingford Center
1815 N. 45th St.

Application: Proposed ground level storefront alterations

Ms. Chave said the ARC reviewed this application on Friday and recommended approval.

Application Comment: Eduardo Ponce said the existing doorway on the north elevation is the main entry. He presented photographs. He said the infill is not original. He said they would replace three doors with a storefront to match the adjacent storefront.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith stated that the storefront is not original, so this project was not harming original material.

Mr. Lee noted that ARC recommended approval of this application.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed ground level storefront alterations. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations 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/WV/VA 9:0:0 Motion carried.

041807.3 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES

041807.31 Cooper House
225 14th Ave E

Jenkins Chan, Project Manager for the Dwelling Company, requested an extension until July 2007. He explained that they are going to request a conditional administrative use of DPD because they could not make the previously proposed condo conversion “pencil out”. He said they would like to wait to finalize the Controls and Incentives agreement until the use is determined. He noted that in the future they may ask for variances related to handicapped parking and a ramp.

The Board recommended that the extension be granted for a longer time period to allow the applicant to work out the unresolved issues.

Action:

I move to approve a six month extension of the consideration of Controls and Incentives Agreement.

MM/SC/JS/MH 9:0:0 Motion carried.

041807.4 BOARD BUSINESS

041807.41 Fort Lawton Landmark District Briefing

Karen Gordon reported that the process to update the existing Fort Lawton ordinance and to codify it is on target. The boundaries of the local and National Register districts will be reconciled and the period of significance will be extended through World War Two. She said the history and description are being rewritten for national and local landmark reports. She noted that some portions of the land where buildings once stood but have since been demolished will be removed from the district and that she expects the Ordinance to be sent to City Council in May at the same time of the Purchase and Sales agreement to purchase the Capehart property. In addition, a Board review structure similar to the Columbia City Review Committee will be established along with design guidelines for the district.

Susan Boyle, architectural historian, reviewed the history of the Fort. She stated that Sonja Sokol Furesz of her office played a primary role in the preparation of this report but is on vacation. Ms. Boyle said Fort Lawton was

created in the late 1880s in response to local citizens' interest in having some defenses on the water after the Boxer rebellion and also because some people anticipated civil unrest related to the growth of labor unions in the Puget Sound region. She said the architecture of the buildings represent the military's hierarchical system and was built with local materials by standardized plans from the Quartermaster. During WWII, she said Fort Lawton was an embarkation point and, in one story significant to local history, was the site of a rebellion by African American soldiers protesting what they perceived to be better treatment of POWs.

Ms. Boyle reported that the US Government gave the property to the City in the 1960s. In the 1970s a design plan was developed that called for the creation of an Urban Wilderness and the removal of most buildings. Due to a lawsuit brought by the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation, Ms. Boyle said that the Parks Department compromised and now maintains the exteriors and the ventilation systems for the teamsters' building and the stables. She said some garages were added to the Fort but their design is harmonious with the other buildings. Ms. Boyle said she recommends the inclusion in the revised Ordinance of the 1940s-era bus station and the chapel.

Ms. Boyle explained the District Boundaries.

Ms. Gordon said the proposal calls for the addition of the chapel which has already been designated as a City Landmark and the removal of a small portion of the District where a demolished building once stood.

Board Questions:

Ms. Tremaine asked why the Navy relinquished the property.

Ms. Gordon said this is part of the Navy's current privatization efforts.

Mr. Hannum asked how the Officers' quarters have been altered.

Ms. Boyle said the interiors were renovated "sensitively" with the addition of new kitchens and bathrooms.

Ms. Gordon noted that the Board has no jurisdiction over the interiors.

Ms. Gordon stated that the City will ask the State to delegate their authority to the Landmark's Board in terms of the review of changes to the properties.

Mr. Abelsen asked if any sub-districts would be considered.

Ms. Boyle said "no" and explained that the residential homes were built all at the same time and that the different buildings are visible to each other.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the styling, landscaping and siting of the fort varies from other forts of that era.

Ms. Boyle stated that the WWII-era forts were more direct and functional than Beaux Arts design of the city.

Ms. Gordon asked if the Board was in support of this proposal.

The Board voted unanimously to support the legislation for adopting the revised ordinance.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator