



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 169/07

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, May 16, 2007– 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Mark Hannum

Ron Martinson

Henry Matthews

Molly Tremaine

Vernon Abelsen

Tom Veith

Virginia Wilcox

Staff

Elizabeth Chave

Rebecca Frestedt

Joanne Walby

Sarah Sodt

Absent

Stephen Lee

Ron Martinson

John Schwartz

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

- 051607.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES** Meeting of May 2, 2007
Mr. Veith made a correction on page two.
Moved to adopt the minutes as presented.
MM/SC/MH/VA 5:0:2 Mr. Lee and Mr. Martinson abstained.

051607.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

- 051607.21 Columbia City Acupuncture and Herbs
4852 37th Ave. S
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Application: Exterior alterations and signage.

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

The proposed business identification sign is approximately 9.5' w x 14" h. The sign will be attached to the vertical face of the plywood awning using four ¼" screws drilled through the sign approximately 2" deep into the awning. Exterior alterations include placement of two terra cotta pots (15" high) on either side of the entrance. The front door will be replaced with a ¾ light stained fir door. A flush mounted lighting fixture will be placed on the underside of the awning outside the front entrance. A 4" x 4" hole will be cut into the underside of the awning to accommodate the outlet box. There is a pre-existing hole cut into the cinderblock exterior wall for electrical cables.

Staff Report: Rebecca Frestedt provided the staff report. She said that May 11th, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the exterior alterations, *with the exception* of the sign placement. She said the Review Committee was concerned about the attachment of the signage to the canopy and maintaining signage consistency throughout the building. She said the Committee suggested that the applicant attach the sign to the mortar joints underneath the windows on the first floor.

Applicant Comment: David McGraw, from Columbia City Acupuncture and Herbs, said that locating the sign on the awning increases visibility and is consistent with the height of other signs on this building. He referenced another business identification sign (Parcel and Post), which is attached in a similar location, on the awning along S. Edmunds St.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked how prevalent this type of signage is in the District.

The applicant said most buildings along Rainier Avenue have blade signs.

Mr. Abelsen suggested hanging the sign below the awning.

The applicant said the awning material may not be strong enough to withstand wind and rain exposure if suspended from the canopy.

Mr. Veith suggested, if the sign is hung from the canopy, that the applicant reinforce the back of the sign in order to strengthen it.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum noted that the inconsistency of signage types and placement makes the building look very "busy". He said the CCRC is concerned with disrupting the horizontal flow of the canopy and thought these signs would be better if they were stacked horizontally.

Ms. Frestedt reported that the applicant was concerned that the depth of the sign would obscure the window if it was suspended from the canopy.

Mr. Lee said he thought the proposed exterior alterations were fine, but discussion of alternatives should occur at the Committee level and referred consideration of the proposed signage back to the Columbia City Review Committee, granting the Committee decision-making authority for the signage portion of the application.

Action:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board referred the approval of a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations with recommendation to the CCRC for review and approval of a revised signage proposal.

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines: Relevant Code citations and guidelines:

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property and Design Guidelines #2. Building Materials and Fixtures, #6 Landscaping

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

051607.22

Fashion Nails

4851 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City Landmark District)

Application: The applicant proposed to replace the existing signage with a 2' h x 3' w wooden (1/2" MDO) sign. The sign will have a white vinyl background with red and blue colored lettering. It will be attached to the Edmunds Street façade with 1/4" x 2" #8 screws.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt stated that the current sign was hung without approval. The applicant came before the CCRC on January 12th, 2007 to request retroactive approval for the current sign. The Review Committee did not support the applicant's request for the current signage on the basis that it was too large in proportion to other signage in the District. Additionally, she said the signage material (corrugated plastic) did not meet the District's Design Guidelines. The current proposal has been submitted in response to the Review Committee's feedback for a smaller sign and alternate materials.

On May 11th, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed signage.

Applicant Comment: There was no comment.

Board Questions: Mr. Abelsen asked about the sign at the top of the building.

Ms. Frestedt stated that this sign had been grandfathered in.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action:

I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed signage. This action is based on the following: The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines: Relevant Code citations and guidelines:

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property and Design Guidelines 11. Signs and b. Blade signs.

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

051607.23

Columbia City Gallery

4864 Rainier Ave S.

(Columbia City Landmark District)

Application: This is a request for renewal of the Certificate of Approval for signage and lighting for the Columbia City Gallery. The Certificate was initially approved in October 2003. The proposed blade sign will be mounted on a steel supportive frame and attached to a wooden panel between the transom windows where the previous signage was located. The support frame will be attached with ½” x 6” lag bolts. The shape of the proposed sign replicates the building’s original signage. This proposal includes two (2) Abolite Angled Reflector lighting fixtures that were included in the original Certificate of Approval.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt stated that on May 11th, 2007, the Columbia City Review Committee recommended renewal of the Certificate of Approval for lighting and signage.

Applicant Comment: There was no comment.

Board Questions: Mr. Veith asked if the lights would be mounting on the building or the sign.

Ms. Frestedt confirmed that they would be mounted on the building.

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: Relevant Code citations and guidelines, SMC

25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property and Design Guidelines 11. Signs.

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

051607.24 The Rainier Club
820 Fourth Avenue

Application: Proposed replacement of existing blue awning with brown awning fabric with the same crenellated valance. The existing awning frames will be used.

Applicant Comment: Todd Rauch and Nathan Bowling presented the application from the Rainier Club. Mr. Rauch said this application to replace the awning is a part of their regular maintenance schedule. He said they propose to change the awning from blue to brown. He presented PhotoShop renderings of the new awning.

Board Questions: There were no questions.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: The Board agreed the proposed new awning color is appropriate.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed awning fabric replacement.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 113459 as the proposed work does 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/TV/MT 7:0:0 Motion carried.

051607.25 Epiphany Chapel
3719 E. Denny Way

Application: Proposed walkway connection between the chapel and the church, including alterations to one window in the chapel.

Ms. Chave stated that this application was reviewed by the ARC, and the ARC recommended approval.

Applicant Comment: John Nesholm of LMN Architects said the church needs this walkway because they have many elderly people using the facilities who have difficulty climbing stairs. He also presented a letter requesting a waiver from the energy code; he said they are requesting R-8 to an R-5 because the chapel is not insulated or heated. He said the wood and glass section is visible from the street and the wood would be painted the same color as the existing trim.

Ms. Chave said the Board decides to support this exemption from the Energy Code they should make a separate motion in support of this exemption.

Board Questions: There were no questions.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: Mr. Abelsen said the proposal is necessary and has a light Touch on the building.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed walkway connection between the chapel and the church, including alterations to one window in the chapel, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #107756 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/MT 7:0:0 Motion carried.

Action:

I move to approve Board support for a departure from the City's energy code and allowing use of R-8 roof insulation.

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

051607.26 Leona/Park Ridge Apartments
916 Queen Anne Avenue North

Application: Retaining wall replacement, two new raised planters, and two new metal balconies on the south elevation

Applicant Comment: Jillian Gant and Ron Wright presented the application. Mr. Wright said the wall in back of the building has no foundation at all. He said their geotechnical engineer said it must be removed immediately. He explained the geotechnical engineer's findings He said the retaining has served as border between the parking lot and upper part of the building. He said the new wall would be only 7-8', not be as tall as the previous one which was 14'. He said the doors will be converted to Juliet balconies with a railing that matches the railing on the other side of the problem. He said they would not be replicating those balconies above.

Board Questions:

Mr. Martinson asked if they had window wells before.

Mr. Wright said yes and they have to remove the dirt in order to get to the retaining wall. He said they will use an ecology block as a sub-structural system.

Mr. Abelsen asked if DPD had approved this.

Mr. Wright said yes.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the doors align with the windows, because it does not appear that way on the drawings.

Mr. Wright said they do align, but the drawings reflect a drafting error.

Ms. Chave asked the applicant to submit corrected drawings and resubmit them to her.

Public Comment: Char Eggleston of Queen Anne Historical Society said she has gotten several calls from people asking if this building is being demolished. She asked how the removal of the wall would affect the view of the building.

Mr. Wright said the building would be more visible once the wall is removed.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee stated that he believes this would be an improvement.

Mr. Veith said he wasn't sure it is an improvement, but it is necessary and appropriate.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed retaining wall replacement, two new raised planters, and two new metal balconies on the south elevation, as per the applicant's submittal.

This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report as the proposed work and 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/MH/VA 7:0:0 Motion carried.

051607.3 NOMINATION

051607.31 Darigold Building
635 Elliott Avenue West

Staff Report: Staff recommends the nomination of the Darigold Building at 635 Elliott Avenue West based on the following designation standards C, D and F. Staff recommends that the features and characteristics proposed for nomination include the site and the exterior of the building, excluding the 1957 addition.

Mr. Lee stated that the Board would not take future development plans into consideration for the nomination meeting.

Applicant Comment: Kimberly Demuth and Jennifer Blackman, architectural historian consultants for the owner, presented the application. Ms. Demuth said the building was designed by John Graham and is currently surrounded by parking lots and 1-2 story buildings. She said there is distinctive terra cotta detailing around the ribbon windows on the east elevation which is intact. She said the terra cotta does not "wrap" along the cornice on the other sides of the building. She said this is unusual for a building designed by John Graham. She said also on the east elevation is the visible addition of the white elevator shaft. She said the new main entrance was relocated to the north of this addition. She presented additional slides of the other elevations, including the west elevation addition of a garage and some new windows and the 1957 addition on the north elevation. She said the basement was used for storage. She said the original entryway still has its casements and fan light but is no

longer used as the main entry. She said the first and second floor hallways have been altered with a recessed ceiling and new lighting. She presented a listing of all the documented alterations to the building.

Ms. Demuth presented photographs of other buildings designed by John Graham with a terra cotta façade, including the Exchange Building, the Bon Marche building, Ford Assembly Plant and the Coca Cola Bottling Plant. She presented slides of other dairy plants around the state.

Ms. Demuth reviewed the landmark criteria and said she does not believe it meets criteria A or B. She said this building does have an association with the history of the dairy industry in Washington State, but there are other plants remaining in the state and this building is not a particularly good example of other Darigold plants. She said the terra cotta detailing on the east elevation is nice, but it is only a small portion of the building; she added that the cornice removal, the construction of the elevator shaft and the new addition have significantly altered the building's integrity. Regarding criterion E, she said John Graham is a significant architect but this is not his best work. She said the building is not particularly prominent and she said she does not believe it meets criterion F.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked how important was the railroad in relation to this building.

Ms. Demuth said it was important for all industrial uses in this area, but was not instrumental in the development of this building, or in the success of the railroad.

Public Comment: Christine Palmer of Historic Preservation referred to their letter written in support of the nomination under criteria CD, D and F and distributed to the Board. She said although there have been alterations the terra cotta, the integrity of the building remains significant. She also said that Lawrence Kreisman of Historic Preservation also wrote a letter to Ms. Demuth arguing that her use of material from his book to claim that the terra cotta was insignificant was incorrect.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Hannum said he did not support the nomination.

Mr. Abelsen said he would support the nomination but would like to see more information in regards to the terra cotta façade and the Darigold sign.

Ms. Tremaine said she would support the nomination because she believes its art deco design is unique and it meets criterion F.

Mr. Martinson said he supports the nomination because the building maintains enough integrity and is a visual landmark on Elliott Way.

Mr. Veith said he agreed with Mr. Hannum and would not support the nomination because he believes the character of the façade was changed due to the loss of the cornice. He said none of the alterations were sympathetic to the building. He suggested the Board nominate the building today, but in general he would not support it.

Mr. Lee agreed that due to the loss of integrity he would not support the nomination.

Action:

I move approval of the nomination for the Darigold Building at 635 Elliott Avenue West 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, excluding the 1957 addition; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 20, 2007; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/VA/RM 4:3:0 Motion carried. Messrs. Hannum, Lee and Veith opposed.

051607.4 BOARD BUSINESS

There being no other Board business, the meeting adjourned

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator