



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 93/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, February 18, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Robert Ketcherside
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair
Sarah Shadid
Mike Stanley
Alison Walker Brems, Chair
Elaine Wine

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Valerie Porter
Matthew Sneddon

Chair Alison Walker Brems called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

021815.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 21, 2015

MM/SC/NC/AL 7:0:1 Minutes approved as amended. Ms. Wine abstained.

Mr. Ketcherside arrived at 3:35pm.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

021815.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

021815.21 Columbia City Landmark District
4915 Rainier Ave. S.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed business signage, for a new restaurant (Sea Salt), consisting of one (1) halo-lit wall sign (dimensions: 11'10" w x 2'6" h); one (1) projecting sign (dimensions: 48" h x 25" w) that will be illuminated by a single 6"h x 8:5"w directional lamp; and vinyl window decals. Exhibits reviewed included plans and renderings. Ms. Frestedt said that on April 17, 2013, the Landmarks Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Approval for Final Design for construction of a new two-story commercial building.

Ms. Frestedt reported that the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application on February 3, 2015. She said the CCRC discussed the construction of an illuminated version of the projecting blade sign and expressed concerns about the proposed method of illumination. The Committee recommended adding a diffuser or spotlighting the sign instead of illuminating the sign from within. The Committee also recommended that the applicant modify the color of the horizontal window decals from a stark white to a cream in order to be more compatible with the window trim. She said following committee deliberations, the committee recommended approval of the proposal, with a recommendation to either diffuse or spotlight the blade sign and to adjust the color of the vinyl decals for the storefront windows.

Janelle Quibuyen explained signage details noting the use of reverse channel letters above the main windows. She said a sea horse blade sign made of rusted steel will be sited to right of main entrance door; it will be spot lit with one light attached to wall. She said that there will be four vinyl strips at the bottom of each window panel and a vinyl restaurant logo. She said the sign is halo lit and into back lit.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Responding to clarifying questions Ms. Frestedt explained that the CCRC thought the white vinyl was too stark because the window trim is cream-colored, so the applicant selected a cream vinyl color, as recommended by the Committee. She said it isn't identical to the trim, but it is close.

Ms. Wine said it seems the signage was designed by committee with three distinct signs going on; she said the vinyl along the base of the window doesn't go with rest.

Ms. Barker said the vinyl band looked diner-esque and that everything else was sophisticated.

Ms. Wine said that she would have preferred to see the vinyl be coordinated with the door signage, but that she wasn't opposed to the applicant's proposal.

Ms. Walker Brems asked the applicant if the cream color the direction the owner wanted to take.

Ms. Quibuyen said it was.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage located at 4915 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed signs meet the following sections of the District ordinance and the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

Relevant Columbia City Design 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 will 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. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

a. Window Signs and Hanging Signs. Generally, painted or vinyl letters in storefront windows and single-faced, flat surfaced painted wood signs are preferred. Extruded aluminum or plastics are discouraged and may not be allowed. Window signs shall not cover a large portion of the window so as to be out of scale with the window, storefront, or facade.

c. Symbolic Three-Dimensional Signs. Symbolic three-dimensional signs, such as a shaving mug, barber pole, pawn shop symbol, or other symbols

illustrating the product being sold on the premises are acceptable provided they meet other sign guidelines. Signs shall reflect the character and use within.

g. Sign Lighting. Sign lighting should be subdued and incandescent. Back-lit signs are prohibited. Signs that flash, blink, vary in intensity, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion shall not be permitted.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards #10

MM/SC/RK/NC 9:0:0 Motion carried.

021815.22 Columbia City Landmark District
Columbia Hotel
4900 Rainier Ave. S.
Proposed awning and sign

Ms. Frestedt read from the staff report and provided an overview of the application. She said that proposal is for installation of a new aluminum-framed, canvas awning for Lottie's. The awning will cover windows on the north and west facades and extend over the entrance. Signage is also proposed for the face of the awning above the entrance to Lottie's. Exhibits reviewed included photographs, plans and material samples.

Ms. Frestedt said the CCRC received a briefing on a variation of the proposal in August 2014. The Committee did not support the initial proposed design and recommended exploration of options that cover individual windows rather than wrap the face of the building. The Committee stated a preference for canvas fabric over a vinyl covering. She said the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application on February 3, 2015. The CCRC discussed two proposed canopy designs. They stated a preference for the preferred alternative, noting that the low profile and position on the building are successful. They reviewed the alternative and agreed that it looked "busy" and that it would be more successful if there were larger separations between the sections. Following committee deliberations, she said the committee recommended approval of the preferred alternative.

Beau Hebert, owner of Lottie's, explained the need for awning because of items falling out of apartment windows above. He said that there is history of awning there and the neighborhood is awning-rich; he provided photos of others in the neighborhood. He said he thought the awning will enhance the building and intersection.

Travis Devers, contractor, said the awning will be made of black powder-coated aluminum with fabric that wraps around. He said the awning will be attached via tie rods and brackets and directed board members to page 5 of the packet for details. He said that there will be no exposed aluminum. He said

the sign will be printed on to vinyl decal and put on front of awning. He said that the made the awning lower profile and added tie rods in response to CCRC comments. He said they explored an alternate design that can be broken into a corner section; it seemed to busy and the Committee said the preferred version was more appropriate.

Mr. Murdock asked how they would mitigate the junction between the two different shapes on the awning.

Mr. Devers said the framing will be three sections bolted together. He said only the front is curved; the front truss is arched.

Responding to question about existing blade sign Mr. Hebert said it will be removed once the awning is up. He said that the proposed awning will extend over seating/waiting areas where people are getting hit. He said that his is one of three retail units and the awning ends where his business ends; he said people don't stand in front of the other businesses.

Ms. Frestedt said that the property owners have put in screens and are trying to work on preventative measures with the tenants.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Murdock noted that he was at the August briefing. He said that the other proposed awning covered recessed bays so less is better; he said they did a great job in improving the submittal.

Mr. Frestedt said the applicants were encouraged to look at other options, such as limiting the width of the awning to the window frame. She said they chose to present the preferred alternative since it will minimize penetrations by adding tie rods.

Ms. Walker Brems said she would support the application if the blade sign is removed.

Mr. Hebert confirmed that it will be.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for awning and signage and with the removal of existing blade sign located at 4900 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed awning and signage meet the following sections of the District ordinance and the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:

10. Awnings/Canopies/Marquees. Marquees, awnings, and canopies will be encouraged at street level. Shiny, high-gloss materials are not appropriate. Distinctive architectural features shall not be covered, nor shall installation damage the structure. Awnings may be installed on upper levels where appropriate.

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 will 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. The primary reference will be to the average pedestrian's eye-level view, although views into or down the street from adjacent buildings will be an integral feature of any review.

The intent of sign regulations is to ensure that signs relate physically and visually to their location; that signs reflect the character and unique nature of the business; that signs do not hide, damage, or obstruct the architectural elements of the building; that signs be oriented toward and promote a pedestrian environment; and that the products or services offered be the focus, rather than the signs.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

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

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

National Parks Service – Preservation Brief #44 - The Use of Awnings on Historic Buildings, Repair, Replacement and New Design

MM/SC/DB/NC 9:0:0 Motion carried.

021815.23 Pacific - Ford McKay Building
615 Westlake Avenue North
Proposed video display monitor

Rhoda Lawrence, BOLA, explained that a video monitor is proposed to go on non-historic wall. She said the screen is 25" x 26" w and will exhibit information on the Brain Institute, a major tenant in the building. She said they propose a stainless steel surround to fade it into the background.

Brian Horman, Vulcan, said that it is much like a reader board but it will change day to day. He said there will be no flashing screen – it will mostly be text. He said they want to invite people in to the institute.

There were board questions about why the proposed site was chosen over the other side where the ramp is. Ms. Lawrence explained that people would stand on the ramp to look at monitor. She said that it is 3 ½' from the building edge because it will be set into the module of stone.

Ms. Barker said she was uncomfortable with it and questioned why a free-standing monitor wasn't selected.

Mr. Murdock said that the location didn't come up at ARC beyond it being in the concrete module. He said it is in non-historic fabric in an unusual building and ARC had no problem with it.

Mr. Luoma said that with the scale of the building this won't really detract significantly.

Ms. Wine agreed with Mr. Luoma and said you can clearly read the transition of new material from old.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation, as the proposed exterior alterations 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/NC/JM 7:2:0 Motion carried. Mmes. Walker Brems and Barker opposed.

021815.3 DESIGNATION

Ms. Walker Brems explained the process for nomination/designation.

021815.31 Eberharter Garage 503 Westlake Avenue North

Seth Startup, Grainger, spoke on behalf of the Green family and said the building does not meet landmark standards and was not supportive of designation.

David Peterson, Nicholson Kovalchick, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and neighborhood and an overview of what he presented at the nomination meeting. He said the area housed a variety of industries, manufacturing, mills, and a second auto row. He said the building had no direct association with auto row. He said that in the 1950s – 1960s zoning changes and I-5 changed the neighborhood a lot – residential was no longer allowed.

He said that the two story reinforced concrete building with post and beam interior, basement was designed and used as a service garage. He said it was a standard plan with car elevator in back and 3 x 5 bay system. He said the ground floor was the service area and upstairs was storage. He noted changes to the building and said the upper floor windows had been changed to aluminum sash, and the alley elevation altered. He said the interior is exposed post and beam construction and he said there is weather damage due to water leaks.

Mr. Petersons said that the Beezer Brothers were known for more ornate and accomplished buildings and particularly for residences and churches. He said that the building was constructed in 1919 for Adolph Eberharter as an investment property; he was better known for small buildings and investment properties. He said the building was used for the Hemphill Diesel School and was just one of many branches around the country. He said that the building is not a good example of auto row building and noted the Pacific and Ford McKay buildings as better examples.

Mr. Peterson said that the building did not meet Criterion C because it was a service garage and had some interesting but not significant tenants over the years. He said that the building did not meet Criterion E because everything was

standard, not unique. He said that it is a very simple standard building; the proportions are pleasing but not exceptional. He said the building doesn't tell us anything about the Beezer Brothers. He said the building did not meet Criterion D because it is typical of its type. He said that its siting is not exception and it doesn't define the neighborhood; it is simply a building on a corner. He said that building has no integrity and while it has original windows at the south elevation the upper level windows are gone.

Rich Hill, McCullough, Hill, Leary, read from a letter (DON file). He did not support designation on any criteria.

Ms. Walker Brems asked about the area survey that had been done.

Ms. Sodt brought a copy and said it was done in 2014 and this building had the potential to meet landmark Ordinance. She said that they looked at every building 40 years and older. She said the area had already been surveys and a number of those buildings have been demolished. She said that Westlake had never been surveyed before; seven properties were identified as potentially eligible.

Public Comment: there was no public comment.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria D and F. She said that not every landmark has to be the Taj Mahal. She said the building can convey what it is and said the emptiness/volume is still there. She said it feels authentic as auto use; she said it is vernacular auto building.

Mr. Carter did not support designation; he said it is a nice building in a building losing character buildings but doesn't rise to the level of landmark.

Mr. Ketcherside agreed with Mr. Carter and did not support designation. He said it doesn't have a strong story so the architecture is important. He said the building doesn't resonate with him although it still shows strength and scale.

Mr. Luoma said the Boren Investment building with its near perfect integrity was easier and the Pioneer Sand and Gravel building had a better story and cultural significance. He said that no one thing stands out with this building but that there will be a sense of loss if it is demolished. He was leaning toward not supporting designation.

Mr. Murdock said the building does speak to the industrial heritage of the area and there aren't many left to convey that. He said that even without the original windows the building can still convey its integrity.

Ms. Shadid said she originally was supportive but after a walk around the building she changed her mind.

Mr. Stanley said he did not support designation and noted the lack of integrity.

Ms. Wine said the building possesses integrity and the loss of windows isn't enough. She said the building is easily recognizable in the neighborhood and it is on a corner so can be appreciated that much more. She said it is significant to the immediate community and city. She said she is sympathetic to the light industrial past. She supported designation on D.

Ms. Walker Brems said what is interesting is the layers of history and evidence of industrial past and that is being lost which is a loss for the City. She said the new buildings are all the same – boring. She supported designation on D and F.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Eberharter Garage at 503 Westlake Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior and interior of the building.

MM/SC/DB/JM 4:5:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Luoma, Carter, Ketcherside, and Stanley and Ms. Shadid opposed.

021815.4 NOMINATIONS

021815.41 Seattle Times Building Complex – Printing Plant 1120 John Street

Ms. Sodt explained that when the original portion of the building was designated the nomination didn't include the 1947 office addition or printing plant building.

Larry Johnson, the Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided the context of the site and neighborhood. He said that the 1930 portion took half the block with the office building in the southeast portion, the printing plant was in the center portion and garage in the rest. He said the printing plant addition and replacement of demolished garage came in 1950; pressrooms in 1963 and 1967, and in 1979 more offices at the north end of the printing plant. He said that a light well separated the office from the printing plant. He said that all windows have been replaced and the L-shaped area windows have been filled in; the industrial steel windows were significant character defining elements.

Mr. Johnson said the building did not meet any of the designation criteria. He said the building does not have the character to convey any significance. He said the Times had four different homes over the years. He said that C. B. Blethen building the circulation and Robert Reimer developed the plant complex. He said that all interior features are gone. He said that the original building is a fine example of Art Deco but the printing plan lacks ornamentation or decoration. He

said that in New York the paper was associated with political power and here it was 'frontiertown'. He said there was fierce competition between the Seattle Times and the Post Intelligencer and the Times built the larger building in 1930. He said they added to building over the years. He said that the 1950 portion was a watered down version of the original building.

He said that Robert Reemer designed better buildings than this and noted Hotel Coronado in San Diego, CA, Old Faithful Inn, and in Seattle the 5th Avenue Theater, 1411 Fourth Avenue Building and the Edmond Meany Hotel among others. He said that Teufel and Carlson were involved in many projects including the Bon Marche. He said that the building doesn't meet criterion E. He said that the buildings take up the whole block and this one doesn't stand out in size and scale. He said that the printing plan contributed to continuity it has lost the ability to convey significance and pales in comparison to the landmarked part.

Responding to clarifying questions he explained that Reemer designed the printing plant and Fey did the 1950 addition.

Mr. Luoma asked why the other buildings were not included in the original nomination.

Ms. Sodt said that it may have been a SEPA referral, so the late 1940s and 1950s construction may not have been referred to the Board at the time.

Mr. Luoma said that he considered this all one building not three.

Ms. Barker asked why the light well was separated from the original building.

Mr. Johnson said he had no idea but was likely for light or maybe for fire protection since they had two buildings burn in the past. He noted the architectural separation said that the office is much more finely detailed and the printing plant is stripped down.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Wine was not sure and wanted to hear from other board members. She said that pieces along Fairview are sympathetic to the original design. She said the loss of windows here is of concern. She said that the building has significant character but not the volume and building as a whole.

Mr. Stanley said there is some character of Deco and the cultural and political impacts are not outstanding. He said he was leaning toward not supporting.

Ms. Shadid said she is leaning toward no. She noted the strong ties to the Times and said it is an interesting piece.

Mr. Murdock said he was confused about why it wasn't nominated before – why they didn't err on the side of caution. He said he wants to look at it again and said it is elegant.

Mr. Luoma said on its own it is a meager brutal building. He said that it is sympathetic to the original, adjacent to and part of it. He noted the cultural and architectural ties to the original building. He supported nomination.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and said the campus is a coherent continuation. He said to look at Fairview elevation where the soup place is.

Mr. Carter supported nomination and said that the printing plant is industrial yet similar to original office building. He said that this was an easier way to produce similar building with similar themes.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and noted that over 100 permits had been issued and noted the ability for this building to be adaptable to constant change.

Ms. Walker Brems said a tour is needed. She said she thinks of it as one building.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Seattle Times Building Complex – Printing Plant located 1120 John Street 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; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 1, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/AL/DB 8:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Shadid opposed.

021815.41 Seattle Times Building Complex – 1947 Office Building Addition
1120 John Street

Larry Johnson prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He said that the original building was symmetrically oriented about the entry bay and the addition changed that. He said the aluminum spandrels match the original and he noted the good integrity on the addition. He provided photos of the 1947 office addition and said the finishes were standard.

He said the building didn't meet any of the standards for designation. He said that the addition is not associated with the Blethen family or the development of the newspaper or neighborhood. He said the original building is from the period of significance but the addition is not. He said that it is from a different period but is compatible but is a replication and would not meet the SOI standards. He said that the new bays are less significant than the original

ones and the addition of them altered the symmetry of the original building. He said the building doesn't rise to the level of their best work for Fey and Teufel and Carlson. He said it is a mid-block building and doesn't stand out.

Mr. Murdock commented that there is no material or craft difference between the original and addition.

Mr. Johnson said it is a seamless addition but noted that Reemer intended symmetry. He said the workmanship is good but the granite is slightly different.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination.

Ms. Barker supported nomination and said it maintains the original façade. She said the entry façade and signage are maintained. She said the addition still works as a period statement of architecture.

Mr. Luoma said this process feels like a long retroactive Certificate of Approval. He supported nomination. He said that everyone sees it as being one building and not separate from the landmark.

Ms. Shadid supported nomination and said it reminds her of the NBBJ addition to McGilvra School; the detriment to the symmetry doesn't bother her.

Mr. Carter said you can't separate the addition from the original. He supported nomination.

Ms. Wine supported nomination and said the addition reads so much as part of the original building.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination and said this process seems to be administrative in nature; it makes sense to include it. He said that ARC saw a proposal to remove it which seemed ridiculous.

Mr. Stanley supported nomination and said it is comparable to the original.

Ms. Walker Brems supported nomination.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Seattle Times Building Complex – 1947 Office Building Addition located 1120 John Street 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; that the public meeting for

Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 1, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/JM/NC 9:0:0 Motion carried.

021815.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator