



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 315/15

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, May 20, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Nick Carter  
Aaron Luoma  
Sarah Shadid  
Matthew Sneddon  
Elaine Wine, Acting Chair

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Robert Ketcherside  
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair  
Mike Stanley  
Alison Walker Brems, Chair

Acting Chair Elaine Wine called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

- 052015.1      APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
April 15, 2015  
MM/SC/NC/AL      6:0:0    Minutes approved.
- 052015.2      CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**
- 052015.21      Columbia City Landmark District  
4800 Rainier Ave. S. – Washington Federal Savings

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

## Proposed storefront and site alterations associated with installation of an ATM

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a thru-wall ATM machine, thru-wall night deposit safe and lighting on the north façade. Proposal includes installation of new metal infill panels within the window openings to surround the equipment, expansion of the existing stairs and installation of a guard rail. Exhibits included plans and photographs. She reported that the building was constructed in 1963 and is a non-contributing building within the District. This site is located outside of the National Register District. She said the Columbia City Review Committee received a briefing on the proposal on April 7, 2015 and offered feedback and recommendations that have been incorporated into the final proposal. She stated that the Landmarks Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Approval for the existing signs in March 2010. She confirmed that on May 5, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application and recommended approval of the proposal.

### Applicant Comment:

Jessica Bradley, Craft Architects, went over site plan and context of the building in the district. She said they will remove existing glazing and infill with metal to match the window mullions; the ATM, surround and night deposit will be installed. There will be no illumination although there will be a wall pack light fixture to meet ATM security requirements – it will be dark bronze.

There was discussion about visibility through the windows and whether or not Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles had been taken into consideration when proposing removal of windows.

Ms. Bradley explained that they conducted a site visit and undertook a study to look at appropriate locations.

Ms. Frestedt said that the original proposal would have sited the equipment along the Rainier Ave. façade and the current proposal seemed most appropriate.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

### Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said the proposal seems consistent with the colors and lighting on the building.

Ms. Wine said she appreciated the desire to match what is there. She said this is not facing Rainier and is low impact.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations located at 4800 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior alterations 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**

**2. Building materials and fixtures.** Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

**4. Storefront.** Building facades should have a greater proportion of window and door openings than wall spaces on pedestrian levels. Any exterior façade alteration shall respect the original architectural integrity of the storefront. Recessed entryways and/or alcoves shall be maintained for existing street-level storefronts. Original fenestration shall be preserved (i.e. windows, transom areas, and door design). Storefront materials should be brick, wood, concrete and tile or a combination thereof.

**5. Transparency.** To provide street-level interest that enhances the pedestrian environment, street-level uses shall have highly visible linkages with the street. Windows at street-level shall permit visibility into the business, and visibility shall not be significantly obscured by security bars or gates, frosting, etching, painting, extensive signage, window darkening film or mirrored film, window treatments or other means.

**Secretary of the Interiors Standards #9 and #10**

MM/SC/DB/SSH      6:0:0    Motion carried.

052015.22

Columbia City Landmark District

4825 Rainier Ave. S. – Bank of America

Proposed exterior and site alterations associated with installation of an ATA with “teller assist” video capacity

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a drive-up ATA with “teller assist” video capacity, modifications to the drive through banking lanes, application of window film and installation of lighting fixtures and signage on the canopy. Exhibits included plans, photographs and specifications. She said the Bank of America building was constructed in 1959. It is a non-contributing building within the District. This site is located outside of the National Register District.

Ms. Frestedt reported that the Columbia City Review Committee received a briefing on the proposal on April 7, 2015 and made recommendations on options for window

film designs and for lighting the area under the canopy. On May 5, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee voiced support for the site alterations, proposed window film and canopy signage. The Committee expressed concern that the intensity and temperature of the proposed lighting under the canopy would not be characteristic of the District. There was a discussion about the colors and branding of the ATA machine. The Committee did not support the all-red cabinet design presented at the meeting, instead Committee members stated a preference for an ATA machine with a neutral-colored base. Following the Committee's deliberations and public comment, the Committee recommended approval of the proposal, with the condition that the ATA box remain a neutral color with a non-illuminated red topper and that the lighting fixtures under the canopy are in the 2700-3000 Kelvin temperature range.

**Applicant Comment:**

Case Creal, Gensler, presented on behalf of the applicant Anna Han. He provided context of the building and said that most of the drive up is visible from Edmonds. He said they propose to remove the vacuum tube station that is there now and they will alter the curbing to allow an 8' wide lane. He said that they will add the ATA machine –beige body with a red topper; it will be non-illuminated. He said they will replace the existing light fixtures with six 3000 Kelvin downlights. He said that they will install white frosted window scribble film at the existing drive-up and will update existing digital signage on leading end canopy to read 'Open / Not Open Assisted Remotely'.

Ms. Barker asked if a lighting study had been done with regard to the flood lights under the canopy.

Mr. Creal said that the canopy light has a required two foot candles for a 50 square foot area. He said the sign is concealed by the bulk of the building.

Ms. Barker asked if the 'Open' sign is hooded.

Mr. Creal said no.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

**Board Discussion:**

Mr. Luoma said the proposal is reasonable. He said that sometimes higher temperature lighting washes out faces.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations and site alterations located at 4825 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed exterior and site alterations 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/General**

- 2. The District should be pedestrian-oriented on the street level.
- 3. The self-contained, small-town quality of the District should be maintained.

**Guidelines/Specific**

**2. Building materials and fixtures.** Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

**4. Storefront.** Building facades should have a greater proportion of window and door openings than wall spaces on pedestrian levels. Any exterior façade alteration shall respect the original architectural integrity of the storefront. Recessed entryways and/or alcoves shall be maintained for existing street-level storefronts. Original fenestration shall be preserved (i.e. windows, transom areas, and door design). Storefront materials should be brick, wood, concrete and tile or a combination thereof.

**5. Transparency.** To provide street-level interest that enhances the pedestrian environment, street-level uses shall have highly visible linkages with the street. Windows at street-level shall permit visibility into the business, and visibility shall not be significantly obscured by security bars or gates, frosting, etching, painting, extensive signage, window darkening film or mirrored film, window treatments or other means.

**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 regulations in Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 23.55 (Signs) and the following guidelines shall apply to signs in the District. The provisions of these guidelines apply to at least the following: (1) any sign located out-of-doors; (2) indoor signs located within three feet of a window and visible from the street, sidewalk or other public place; and (3) "place of business" identification signs.

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 #9 and #10**

MM/SC/NC/AL            6:0:0    Motion carried.

052015.23

Columbia City Landmark District  
3714 S. Hudson St. – Esmay Building  
Proposed exterior alterations and construction of a 660 sq. ft. addition

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed work consisting of new storefront systems and windows, including two roll-up garage doors; construction of an entry vestibule and canopy on the south façade; infill of a garage door and two window openings on the east façade. She said two alternate infill materials are proposed, Hardi and CMU She summarized the installation of exterior light fixtures; new exterior paint colors; installation of rooftop mechanical equipment; construction of a 660 sq. ft. addition on the north (alley) façade to house a walk-in freezer/cooler and relocation of the gas meter.

Ms. Frestedt said that the Esmay Building is a one-story commercial/garage building constructed in 1947. It is a non-contributing building within the district. The building is of masonry and concrete block construction supported by a poured concrete foundation. She said that the Landmark Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations in March 2014. The applicant's current proposal will take the place of work associated with prior approvals. On May 5, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application and recommended approval of the proposal. The recommendation included support for the preferred alternative for the infill of the two openings on the east façade, noting that additional maintenance of the material may be required over time.

Applicant Comment:

Roz Edison, business owner, explained the proposed commissary kitchen (for Marination) and expanded restaurant concept. She said they want to open the space to light and access and honor the roots of the building as auto rebuilder. She said this has been a dark area and they will brighten it up.

Bryan Borchers, Strata Architects, said they will put in a new garage door in window openings and recess entry back into building. He said the new window openings will mirror others. He said the garage doors will allow the interior to spill out. He said the service stuff will be toward the back. He said the service door will be in an existing window opening. He said they will relocate an existing gas meter. He said they will infill openings with Hardi panels and noted it is reversible; he said they originally proposed CMU. He said they propose a small canopy to mark the entrance. He said there will be new lighting to highlight the signage and smaller perimeter lighting.

Ms. Shadid asked if they were going to keep the original sign.

Ms. Edison said they won't retain the sign but they will keep the style.

Ms. Wine asked about the lower height of the addition.

Mr. Borchers said there is an 8' plate height; 8'6" to the top of the roofing membrane.

Ms. Wine asked if they looked at other additions in the district.

Mr. Borchers said they did and all seemed different in their approach. He said they looked at the Guidelines. He said they want it to stand on its own; it looks like an addition but it doesn't look like it is trying to mimic the original building.

Mr. Sneddon noted that the addition is in a low visibility area.

Ms. Edison said that it is back behind two alleys.

Mr. Borchers said it is a dark alley but there is visibility through. Responding to questions he said that they have no structural work proposed for the existing building and he noted that existing seismic work is on the interior. He said that rooftop mechanical is all sited toward the back alley behind the barrel vault roof. He said the hood is not visible from Rainier or Hudson. He said the equipment will be unfinished.

Mr. Luoma asked if they had considered a longer canopy.

Mr. Borchers said they had but they prefer what is being proposed; they want to keep the simple lines of the building intact.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Sneddon said he appreciated the design of the in-fill that allows the openings to read on the façade. He said the work is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards; it preserves the building form and it still has a value on its own.

Ms. Wine said she supports the proposal to infill the windows with Hardi on the east facade. She said that it is an interesting application. She noted that it is not a contributing building; if it were there would be more effort to make.

Ms. Barker said the addition is sympathetic to the District without trying to mimic historic features.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations, lighting and construction of an addition, located at 3714 S. Hudson St. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations and construction of an addition meet the following sections of the District ordinance and the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

**Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:**

**2. Building Materials and Fixtures.** Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

**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:

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.

**4. Storefront.** Building facades should have a greater proportion of window and door openings than wall spaces on pedestrian levels. Any exterior façade alteration shall respect the original architectural integrity of the storefront. Recessed entryways and/or alcoves shall be maintained for existing street-level storefronts. Original fenestration shall be preserved (i.e., windows, transom areas, and door design). Storefront materials should be brick, wood, concrete, and tile, or a combination thereof.

**5. Transparency.** To provide street-level interest that enhances the pedestrian environment, street level uses shall have highly visible linkages with the street. Windows at street-level shall permit visibility into the business, and visibility shall not be significantly obscured by security bars or gates, frosting, etching, painting, extensive signage, window darkening film or mirrored film, window treatments, or other means. The intent is to encourage pedestrians to focus on the products or services offered, rather than the signage.

**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.

**12. Additions to Existing Buildings**

- a. All new additions, penthouses, and building systems equipment shall be located to allow the architectural and historic qualities of the building to be dominant when viewed from the public right-of-way or other primary viewpoints.
- b. Although additions to historic buildings are not discouraged, they should be located to maintain the integrity of the primary facade. Additions shall not be attached to the primary façade. It is generally inappropriate to construct a story that is a full-floor addition.
- c. Building additions should be compatible with the massing, scale, form, fenestration and materials of the original building. However, an addition should be designed to be recognized as a product of its own time and should be distinguishable from the historic building.

**Secretary of the Interior Standards #9 & 10**

MM/SC/AL/DB            6:0:0    Motion carried.

052015.24

Columbia City Landmark District  
3715 S. Hudson St.  
Proposed bike corral within the right-of-way

Ms. Frestedt explained the request for retroactive approval of a bike corral within the right-of-way. She said the on-street corral will include 2 wheel stops, 2 flexible delineator posts, 2 bicycle symbols and 6 bicycle racks. Exhibits included photographs and plans. She said on May 5, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application and recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:



Kyle Rowe, SDOT, explained that the bike corral deck will mount to two rails and directed board members to the drawing and legend for details.

Ms. Wine asked about installation of common rails. She asked if they considered installing the rails individually.

Mr. Rowe said common rails reduce the number of penetrations to the sidewalk. He said that some modifications could be made, but the current configuration meets SDOT standards. He noted it was installed late last year.

Public comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Wine was interested in how they have been installed in historic districts. She said she would not want to see this installed on cobbles or bricks and that painting and striping are not supported. She said they need to look toward flexibility in historic districts.

Mr. Rowe said that some elements are necessary for safety and noted they won't do it at Pike Place Market.

Ms. Wine said that different options might make it more appropriate for historic districts.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for street use for street use located in the right-of-way adjacent to 3715 S. Hudson St. This action is based on the following:

The proposed street use meets the following sections of the District ordinance and the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

**Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:**

**Guidelines/Specific**

**7. Street Use.** Any work that affects a street, alley, sidewalk, or other public right-of-way, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board. Emphasis shall be placed on creating and maintaining pedestrian-oriented public spaces and rights-of-way. Street trees and other plant materials that add human enjoyment to the District shall be encouraged, Decorative treatments within the sidewalk, including special paving patterns and building entryway tiling shall be preserved. The use of alleys for services and public-oriented activities shall be encouraged.

**Secretary of the Interiors Standards #10**

MM/SC/DB/SSH      6:0:0    Motion carried.

052015.25

Lyon Building

607 Third Avenue

Proposed window rehabilitation and replacement

Michael Sullivan, Artifacts, explained the proposed changes to accommodate special needs clients. He said that most of the building's wear is on the other

two facades. He said that they proposed to rehabilitate the wood window on the primary façade. He said the upper sash on the double hung window is fixed and they have added veneer over the sash to recreate a line. He said they will rabbit out upper and lower sash so they will have a shadow line and will use a thinner glass panel. He said they will lose the veneer and the glazing panels will be puttied back in. He said they will keep all the original Douglas fir. He said they did a window survey and the upper sash is different from the lower now so they worked on options. He said they will use clear glass which has minimal reflectivity.

Mr. Sullivan said on the back side of the building there are a variety of conditions. He said that replacements were done – wire glass, ventilators, and mechanical systems – and now wood window reproductions will be put in.

Ms. Wine said that ARC saw this twice and did a comprehensive review. She said that it is very proactive and the existing conditions are well-documented. She said that they are utilizing all wood and rehabbing existing. She said ARC was supportive. She said that it is an in-kind replacement.

Ms. Barker said she had no issues.

Mr. Sneddon said that they did a window survey and noted that a small amount on the alley façade were reusable. He said that they provided salvage material so they have a stockpile for front façade.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board members thought it was an improvement to the building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations, at the Lyon Building, 607 Third Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 118236 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/NC/AL          6:0:0    Motion carried.

052015.31

National Cash Register Building  
1923-1927 Fifth Avenue

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, said that in 2007 the Landmarks Board voted not to designate the building and he hoped this board would do the same.

Larry Johnson, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and the mid-block building that takes up the entire site. He said that the terracotta was from a catalog. He said the finials are gone. He said that the street level façade – black, polished marble – is in good condition. He noted the carved relief molding around the doors. He noted the mahogany doors and sidelights. He noted the bronze horizontal and vertical mullions. He said the interior was altered and had no integrity; he said originally there were 18' ceilings and large volume. He said that the terracotta is in good condition except for some weathering and staining. He said that the second floor was once accessed by an open staircase that was closed in with a door at some point. He noted the loss of the upper storefront transom windows.

Mr. Johnson said the building did not meet criteria A, B, C, D, E or F and noted that the 2007 board voted no to designation. He said that building was a speculative one and was not constructed per the drawings; the marble covers what should have been terracotta. He said that there are better examples of architect John Kercher's work including the Medical/Dental Building, El Rio Apartments and Park Vista Apartments. He said that the building was not associated significantly with the Denny Regrade and noted the various tenants that used the building over the years. He said that the upper details is interesting and in good condition. He said that the marble is disharmonious and was pasted on for a Moderne look. He said that the building does not embody a particular style. It is a small building that falls short in comparison to others.

Mark Morden provided information on terracotta buildings and explained that they are typically low rise – one to three stories. He said that the masonry, cladding is typically one primary material. He said that large openings are typical and there is an emphasis on verticality with a clear visual hierarchy. He noted the connection with the ground plane and provided photo examples of the style. He said that the subject building does not embody the style: there is no sense of verticality, no visual hierarchy, no primary material – marble and terracotta are equal, and the building is not grounded.

Mr. Morden said that the terracotta is not original; it is derivative. He said the finials are missing as is the originally planned terracotta above the windows. He said that the marble was part of original construction. He said that terracotta manufacturer catalogs sell complete facades. He said that there are better examples of the polychrome glazed terracotta at Kress and Arctic buildings

among others. He said the diaper pattern tile is better at The Lofts Studios and the Pacific McKay buildings. He said that the terracotta is nice but not distinctive. He said the building does not meet Criterion D.

Mr. McCullough said the building was not built as designed and lacks integrity. He said it lacked integrity when it was built.

Mr. Luoma asked if they were aware of other buildings with the green-black marble on the first floor like this one.

Mr. Johnson said there is one around the corner and the marble was put on there later. He said that the owner was the builder who wanted a more modern building than the architect and it is when vitrolite panels were popular.

Mr. Morden said the Broderick Building has it as well.

Mr. Luoma noted the building that houses Fado.

Ms. Wine asked which was more expensive, the marble or terracotta.

Mr. Johnson said the marble was probably less expensive than the tile.

Public Comment:

John Sosnowy, area resident, said the beauty of the terracotta is spectacular from the Monorail. He said he would hate to see the building disappear. He said their comments were speculation.

Beth Bennett, area resident, said she appreciated the components of old Seattle and the buildings from the 1920s and 1930s. She said she hated to see it being chopped off at Pike Street. She said the building was intentionally put it, it is distinctive and has integrity. She said it is important to retain buildings and we will lose a lot of old Seattle if this building is gone.

Natalie Price, read from a letter from Belltown Business Association (letter in file). She provided a letter from Becca Stordahl (in DON file). Both supported development.

Monica Adams spoke of quality of life and said that the terracotta and craftsmanship provide history. She said the building should be preserved.

Albert Cheng said the building is gorgeous and meets criteria C, D, and E. He said the building is a source of splendor and variety and contributes to the area. He noted the polychromatic ornament that is close to street level and prominent from the Monorail. He said it is original and in good condition. He noted the local terracotta industry. He said that other buildings in the area have nowhere

near the lovely intricacy of the 26 distinct tile patterns. He said it would be a shame to see it disappear.

Oonagh O'Connor, said there were many more terracotta buildings in 2007 and that has changed in eight years.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Sneddon said the arguments based on drawings were unconvincing and because they couldn't find the original drawings doesn't mean the building wasn't built as planned. He said that the building as an outlier is important and demonstrates shifts in history. He said that two architectural eras are incorporated into this building and you can see the distinction between commercial and office in new materials. He noted the diversity of the building's value. He disagreed with the position that catalog terracotta lessens its significance and doesn't consider that many landmarked buildings have used the same. He said by the 1920s it was common to order from catalogs and now architects do it all the time. He said the bad renovation argument wasn't convincing. He supported designation on Criterion D. He said that with regard to the NCR relationship he said it is an interesting corporate history but this was a branch and not an architectural statement of the business.

Mr. Carter said he was conflicted – the terracotta is nice to look at from the Monorail. He said that from the street view it looks like the marble was added on. He said that as a whole the building doesn't rise to the level of landmark and doesn't work with two offsets. He said he was leaning toward 'no'.

Mr. Luoma said that at the nomination meeting he was not convinced and would not support designation. He said that the terracotta is nice but it is missing finials. He said the bronze mullions and green marble are noteworthy but as a whole it doesn't work. He said it doesn't exemplify a landmark and doesn't have landmark elements. He said that if was an outlier landmark it was not mimicked elsewhere. He said that it is a mismatch although unique. He said that there is no connection to NCR.

Ms. Shadid said she was glad to hear public comments. She supported designation and said that the exterior has outstanding integrity. She said it is unusual to see the bronze mullions preserved and she noted the frieze with carvings. With regard to 'bad taste' she said that the board is not to decide if we agree with the taste. She said because terracotta came from a catalog doesn't make it less important. She said regarding the 2007 board's decision this is a new board and the decision is based on our weight and decisions. She said that even as a speculative hodgepodge building it fits with the prospector frontiersman element of Seattle. She said it preserves the character of Seattle and we risk being devoid of character. She said the marble and terracotta speaks to the story of the building and adds to its character. She supported designation on criteria C and D.

Ms. Barker said there was no design review board back then. She said it has integrity – the scale and openings are the same. Although the finials are gone the terracotta and marble are still there. She said that the quality is fine and said that the diaper tiles have more layering and are richer than other examples provided. She echoed Mr. Sneddon’s comments about two eras of architecture shown on one building. She said that it has integrity and she supported designation.

Ms. Wine supported designation and said it is unusual to have so much integrity. She said this is original and has the original sash windows; she was not concerned with the loss of finials. She said that original openings are there and the detail is there. She said the building can convey the period of construction but embodying two styles within one period is unusual. She said the building is a very small modest mid-block jewel box which gives it more character. She said there are other landmarks in Seattle that have modified storefronts. She said a building doesn’t have to be completely custom to be a landmark. She supported nomination on Criterion D.

Ms. Shadid said that the matter of taste is not a designation standard.

Mr. Carter said he was leaning toward not supporting designation. He said that the terracotta looks great but the building as a whole doesn’t rise to landmark status. He said that one element is not enough to save.

Ms. Shadid said six votes were required to designate and suggested further discussion.

Mr. Luoma said that there is no harmony to materials and design and the building is unique but not in a good way. He said it is not a successful style and it is disharmonious.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the National Cash Register Building at 1923-1927 Fifth Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C and D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/SSH/DB 4:2:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Carter and Luoma opposed.

**052015.4**

**NOMINATION**

052015.41

100 Denny Way Building  
104 Denny Way

Owners Gerry and Kerry Magnuson were not in support of nomination.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and the vernacular building. She said that the brick and parapet on the west façade are original but noted that all windows and storefronts have been altered. She pointed out an area that sustained damage in 1974 and brick, storefront, glass, mullions, and tile were replaced; she noted the tile replacement was not a good match. She reported that brick on the south façade failed in 2006 and was replaced with metal. The original marquee was removed in 1981. She said the original cast stone coping is not under the metal flashing. She said the interior has been modified extensively.

Ms. Mirro said the building was constructed in 1929 for the American Finance Company by Albert B. Cornelius. She said the building did not meet any of the criteria for nomination. She said there were no significant associations with this building which housed various tenants over time. She said it was not significantly associated with the development of Queen Anne or Belltown; it was on the street car line – all businesses were. She said the building has minimal decorative ornaments and brick work and there are other vernacular multi-tenant commercial buildings that are better examples and retain more architectural integrity. She said the building doesn't stand out, and noted the nearby Space Needle as prominent.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker commented that it was a key location and there was only one photo. She supported nomination on Criterion F and noted the 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue view. She said the rhythm of the building is still intact.

Ms. Shadid did not support nomination. She said that although spatially recognizable it has been too heavily modified.

Mr. Luoma said the building benefits from its location. He noted the long facades provide a nice pedestrian experience but noted the location is prominent not the building.

Mr. Carter did not support nomination. He said that it is on a corner and it needs more prominence than to just be on a corner. He said there has been damage done to the building.

Mr. Sneddon did not support nomination, although he said the building has some interesting aspects. He said there are typical 1920s elements – stepped parapets, tile and scrolling detail – but that there has been too much loss of integrity.

Ms. Wine said the building is recognizable in the neighborhood, and there is a certain comfort and texture to the pedestrian streetscape. But she noted integrity issues and did not support nomination.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the 100 Denny Way Building at 104 Denny Way as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350

MM/SC/SSH/NC 5:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker opposed.

**052015.5 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

052015.51 Pioneer Sand & Gravel Company Building  
901 Harrison Street

Jack McCullough explained the request for 30-day extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Pioneer Sand & Gravel Company Building for 30 (thirty) days.

MM/SC/DB/NC 6:0:0 Motion carried.

**052015.6 BRIEFING**

052015.61 Terminal Sales Annex  
1931 Second Avenue  
Briefing on proposed new construction

Ms. Sodt explained the project was approved in 2008 but was never built. She explained that now there will be a different MUP and Certificate of Approval. She said the applicants have been to ARC quite a few times and the proposal has changed. She said they have modified the design based on ARC comments and they are looking for a read from the full Board.

Jack McCullough said originally the building was to be 400' tall and currently it will be half that height. He said the landmark will stand more proud of the new building.

Dave Heater presented via PowerPoint (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and showed tower adjacency diagram. He said that they plan a 17-story tower and went through iterations as the design developed. He said they added larger mass along the second and third story with a gasket between that and the landmark. He said that the tower is set back 23' from the landmark and that they will align floors to match historic floors and windows. He said they have removed the solid clay tile walls from the sides and will maintain the front façade.

*Mr. Sneddon left at 6:50 pm.*

Mr. Heater said the historic entry will remain functional for retail and there will be a new entry on 2<sup>nd</sup>. He said a porte cochere is proposed along the alley.

He went through historic photos and said they will expose portion of sidewalls. He noted the windows of the landmark have changed; the leaded glass is gone and they need to be functional. He said they did a window survey and all windows are highly damaged beyond repair and more are non-original. He said they propose to replace all glass and



windows in the same proportions and divided lights with thin muntins and using insulated glass. He said they will upgrade the landmark siding with stone cladding. He said the lobby will be on the corner. He said they will maintain the rhythm of the landmark and will use clear glass in and around the landmark. He said they propose thin rooms that are unique and in proportion with the landmark.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma asked how the gasket space will interact with the landmark and the tower.

Ms. Barker said she likes the idea of a gasket. She noted page 18 and said when she sees it - it has an intrusive feel. She expected it to be non-occupiable space with no windows and be neutral. And that it would show off the landmark much better. She said the visual of the gasket fights with landmark. She said she likes the gasket but encouraged it be neutral non-occupied or non-broken up planes. She suggested that it is better to tone down the monumentality of the addition – the height is ok but it is too blocky and too strong and doesn't allow the landmark to shine. She said that it feels like it is in competition with the landmark.

Mr. Luoma noted the proposed used of stone on the side walls and suggested they keep more of the historic character than using a brand new material.

Mr. Heater said they talked to the Design Review Board and suggested rougher concrete; he said there was not a lot of enthusiasm.

Ms. Sodt explained that the Design Review Board is advisory; this board is regulatory. She requested an exploration of alternate materials.

Mr. Luoma said it is doing the landmark a disservice to rebuild a new wall. He said that clear glass is an interesting idea but expressed concern that with a straight on view the building appears so light and clear that there is not enough contrast.

Mr. Heater said that even with clear glass is will be different because of the difference between interior and exterior light.

Ms. Wine said that the Terminal Sales Annex is a gem in Seattle – strong building, proportions, and verticality. She said that at first look the proposal doesn't celebrate the building – it is dancing around that they have to deal with the landmark. She said she wants to see the building as a whole. She said she didn't want slick new panels on the sides and preferred original stucco texture. She suggested they study New York City examples of narrow infill buildings. She said she doesn't like the depression/gasket around the building and is more in favor of strong verticality. She said the overall composition is not as strong as it could be. She said a different proportion trying to play with it without the Annex being swallowed up.

Ms. Wine said she still wants to read the building as a building; what is proposed is approaching façadism. She said she would love to see the building slicing through the hotel. She said aligning the floor levels with the landmark is a nice gesture. She said the gasket is almost a picture frame. She said what is going on takes away from the

landmark. She asked how the gasket could be improved. She suggested more opacity and less busyness (fewer mullions etc).

Ms. Shadid said she was surprised the previous design was approved and said it was façadism. She likes where they are headed now and that the new is pushed back. She said that because the hotel is pushed back it reads almost as three different buildings. She said it could be taken further and noted that the clear frame is not as successful as it could be. She said it is a huge improvement on the original.

Ms. Sodt said that what Ms. Shadid said was a good response to what Mr. Murdock said about pedestrian perspective.

Ms. Shadid asked if the board would review window replacement.

Mr. McCullough said they would.

Mr. Carter said they are projecting the landscape forward. He said it would be nice to have side walls match what they are now.

**052015.7 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator