



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 822/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, December 16, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson
Deb Barker
Kathleen Durham
Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Chair
Julianne Patterson
Matthew Sneddon

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Genna Nashem

Absent

Nick Carter
Mike Stanley

Acting Chair Jeffrey Murdock called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

121615.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 4, 2015
MM/SC/DB/AL 8:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Johnson abstained.

121615.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

121615.21 Fort Lawton Landmark District
Proposed installation of signage

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Postponed.

121615.22

Harvard Belmont

750 Belmont Ave E

Proposed removal and replanting of trees

Ms. Nashem explained the proposed removal and replanting of street trees.

Mr. Luoma said Big Leaf Maples 4 and 5 are problematic. He said the three Birch trees were not properly pruned and do not look healthy. He said he believes removing them is appropriate. For new trees Paperback Maple should be fine but he would defer to the City Arborist recommendation. He said new trees should be a minimum of 5' from the sidewalk and 10' from power pole.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Luoma suggested conditioning motion to add 'or recommended by City Arborist'.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for removal of three Birch trees and two Big Leaf Maple trees and replant with 5 new Paper Bark Maple trees or as recommended by City Arborist

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed restorations plans as presented December 16, 2015 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the buildings as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

3. Landscaping:

Guideline: Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.

Guideline: Maintain the alignment and spacing of street trees. Planting street trees where none now exist is encouraged. Existing street trees are important and pruning should be done only in a professional manner to maintain the trees health and to retain the natural form.

The existing trees will be replaced to match the number of existing trees. The trees will be planted in a pattern similar to existing street trees allowing more room next to the existing poles.

MM/SC/RK/DB

10:0:0 Motion carried.

121615.23

Columbia City Landmark District

3851 S. Angeline St. – private residence

Proposed paint colors.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed revisions to exterior paint color for the home and garage. Exhibits included photographs, renderings and samples. The home was constructed in 1981. It is located outside of the Columbia City National Register District. The home previously had a two-color scheme. The current color was not reviewed or approved by the Board. On December 1, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee voiced support for the base color and recommend selection of more subdued trim and accent colors. The Committee recommended approval of the proposal, with refinements to the trim and accent colors to be presented to the Board.

Stephen Tapp indicated that they have selected more subdued colors than what was presented to the CCRC.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said it is a reasonable proposal and an improvement on the current conditions.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations (paint colors) located at 3851 S. Angeline St. This action is based on the following:

The proposed paint colors meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

**Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:
Guidelines/Specific**

3. Building Surface Treatments. Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces. Painted surfaces shall be:

- a. Repainted with the original historic color(s) of the building, provided that the business or property owner obtains a professional color analysis; or
- b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an "historic colors" palette that may be useful as a guide. The Board Coordinator also has a palette of historic colors that may be used as reference.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards #9 and #10

MM/SC/DB/MS 10:0:0 Motion carried.

121615.24

Cal Anderson Park / former Lincoln Park
1000 East Pine Street

Proposed trees and site alterations at northwest corner of park

Elma Borbe, Sound Transit and Richard Gholaghong, DOPAR confirmed that the Chinese Scholar tree is a heritage tree and is over 100 years old. They described the proposed alternate tree planting and landscape plan.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma asked if the Arborist recommended anything other than “mulch and observe” at the Scholar tree.

Applicants said they had specifications for mulch and inoculation.

Mr. Luoma said it would be good to keep heavy equipment out of the scholar tree drip zone.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed tree planting and landscaping at the northwest corner of the site, at Cal Anderson Park / former Lincoln Park, 1000 E. Pine Street.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed tree planting and landscaping does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121042 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. This approval does not preclude the property owner from executing the wall design, site lighting, paving, and planting plan as approved by the Landmarks Preservation Board under LPB 329/04.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/AL/RK 10:0:0 Motion carried.

121615.25

Northwest Rooms & International Fountain Pavilion

305 Harrison Street

Proposed alterations to north breezeway at NW Rooms

Andrew Stewart and Grace Kim, Schemata Workshop, and Diane Hilmo, Seattle Center presented refinements to proposal in response to ARC feedback.

Applicants presented their proposed changes to the breezeway, including significant changes to the skylight and roof opening proposal showing large guardrails around all three of the elements. Ms. Doherty said she was unaware that they were planning to show a different proposal to the Board, and said the proposed skylight alterations would need to return to the ARC for re-review.

Mr. Murdock said he is in favor of everything except the guardrails at the roof skylights.

Mr. Kiel said they should look at skylights that can support the impact of someone's fall. He said they could also look at striping a warning on the roof surface and add fall restraint, in lieu of the awkward guardrails.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site and exterior alterations to the north breezeway of the Northwest Rooms, 305 Harrison Street, as per the attached submittal, excluding the new skylights and roof opening design.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed site and exterior alterations, do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 124584 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale 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/JK/JP 10:00 Motion carried.

121615.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

121615.31 The Gaslight Inn
1727 15th Avenue

Ms. Doherty went over the signed agreement.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for The Gaslight Inn, 1727 15th Avenue.

MM/SC/RK/AL

121615.32 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Request for an extension

Ms. Doherty explained that the owner sent a letter (in DON file) requesting a three month extension. She said it seems like a reasonable amount of time to come back and provide an update on progress on the proposed design.

Nathan Rimmer, owner representative, said that the designated site is mostly open space - 18 acres. He said there are a few buildings on it – about 50,000 sf of built space on the campus and it is zoned single family. He said there is some conflicts in use right now with underlying zoning. He said they have been trying to figure out how to get to a development plan to get to the economics to work on this site as well as to be respectful of the landmark. He said they have gone through a series of concepts with their architect, Susan Jones, Atelier Jones, and Bill Bain who was the original designer on the site to try and figure out what they could do here to make it work. He said that last time they brought it to the board they had a concept that used Planned Residential Development

(PRD) provision in the Land Use Code to allow infill development of essentially townhouses and retaining some level of existing buildings that are on the site with higher uses that the Landmarks Board would provide the authority for that slight commercial use as in the existing spaces to preserve them. He said that they were proposing – there are seven buildings on the site – and they had been looking at removing potentially two of them for higher value townhome use as the board had asked to see how we got to that conclusion, what the density difference looked like, the office built space versus the townhomes count that was there. He said they had Ms. Jones go through that and they looked at potentially micro-housing in two of the buildings they were looking to demolish. He said they didn't think that worked from a land use standpoint very well. He said they also had concerns about the PRD and they entire process of going through that so they stepped back and looked at doing something that keeps potentially all of the buildings and just infills the site with basically single family homes – it can support 30 or 32 homes on the site – and keep the other buildings and the commercial uses in them. He said that is where they ended up and in the mean time they had two private schools approach them about using the site. He said it is set up well for that and they have always thought it was set up very well for that. He said they have had conversations in the past years with other schools but no one really stepped up with serious enough interest. He said that coincidentally there are a couple schools that are considering that and they want to let that run its course over the next sixty days and see if any of that materializes before they pick back up on this other land use plan to again try to preserve the rest of the buildings and have some compatible infill development. He said that both of these schools would require a level of expansion on the site and they have advised them - they would think about the site being cognizant of the landmark, the things they have learned and the things the landmarks board is interested in preserving – fitting infill in a sensitive and compatible way. He said that everyone has been trying to make this site work for 20 – 30 years and they will go about it three months at a time and come up with something that works.

Mr. Murdock asked if “single family infill” meant using the same ideas generally about the design to preserve view corridors; he asked if they are mostly around the perimeter of the site.

Mr. Nimmer said they are mostly around the existing infrastructure so using the existing road system to try to preserve some of those view corridors. He said there is a big open space in the middle and they had looked at preserving that view corridor from that entry as you go in and really trying to put them around existing roads. He said that it works well with the landmark and also they could reduce the infrastructure cost and would not need as much density on the site.

Mr. Ketcherside said he appreciated the added detail knowing that there are other conversations going on.

Mr. Murdock said that to put another use in there really uses that site and doesn't require so much alteration and change would be a great opportunity.

Mr. Rimmer said the interiors of the buildings weren't designated so they have always considered the ability to change those around as necessary but some of it works pretty well – basic building envelopes that are there will probably work pretty well.

Ms. Barker said the site is designated and asked if any vegetation had been lost with recent storms.

Mr. Rimmer said that usually a couple of trees are lost every year this time just given the age of the site but to his knowledge they hadn't lost any, but property management doesn't always keep him fully up to speed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Luoma said he was intrigued by alternatives being explored. He said that may be easier to adapt to site than what has been seeing and it will be worthwhile to check out.

A Board member asked if Bain was the one who designed the funky Office building with the small spaces.

Mr. Rimmer said it was building G and that Mr. Bain was the lead architect, and David Hoedemaker was actually the one who designed it.

It would be interesting to hear design concept.

Mr. Rimmer said that Ms. Jones put one together and there are various ways to get the ADA variances because it is a landmarked building and you might be able to use those side offices for a single attorney practice or CPA etc. He said you could probably get some decent rents out of it but if you wanted to make it single user you have to lower the upper and lower and have elevator shaft thing sticking out of it.

A Board member said they were more interested in what the original architect design concept was.

Mr. Rimmer said it was purpose built. He said to try to determine what Battelle was thinking when they designed something – they were really in charge of that and directing the show – and that they didn't think about how to use the space most efficiently but rather what they wanted. He said he asked Mr. Bain the same thing and hasn't responded.

Ms. Doherty asked Mr. Rimmer if Ms. Jones has looked at adaptive reuse scenarios for the Office and Lodge buildings, and would she be able to present those at the next briefing?

Mr. Rimmer said it is ready to go and he could present it, but they just have a couple other options they thought would make more sense.

Ms. Doherty said they have been responsive to that and hope options will be presented next time.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center, 4000 NE 41st Street, for three months.

MM/SC/DB/AL 10:0:0 Motion carried.

121615.33

Wayne Apartments
2224 Second Avenue

Request for an extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for 3- month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Wayne Apartments, 2224 Second Avenue for three (3) months.

MM/SC/RK/MSN 10:0:0 Motion carried.

121615.34 Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building
1525 11th Avenue
Request for an extension

Jessica Clawson explained the request for a four (4) month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building, 1525 11th Avenue for four (4) month extension.

MM/SC/RK/AL 10:0:0 Motion carried.

121615.35 White Motor Co. Building
1021 E. Pine
Request for an extension

Jessica Clawson explained the request for a four (4) month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the White Motor Co. Building, 1021 E. Pine for four (4) months.

MM/SC/RK/MSN 10:0:0 Motion carried.

121615.4 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator