



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 68/17

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
City Hall  
600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room  
Wednesday, February 1, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Kathleen Durham  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel, Acting Chair  
Kristen Johnson  
Jeffrey Murdock  
Julianne Patterson  
Steven Treffers  
Emily Vyhnanek

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Genna Nashem  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Deb Barker  
Matthew Sneddon

Acting Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**020117.1      APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
December 7, 2016 and January 4, 2017    Deferred.

**020117.2      CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

020117.21

Harvard Belmont

770 Belmont Ave E

Alterations to the existing building including an addition

Paul Kimcyck explained the changes are necessary to meet the needs of his family.

Paul Whitney, architect, explained the structure is made up of the original house plus two additions, the smallest of which (233 square feet) is proposed to be removed. He said that the house was converted to duplex and used as rental for most of its life and this will return it to a single-family home. He said original windows have been removed. He said they propose to replace windows more compatible with a historic house. He said they will open up some windows that had been filled in. He said one of the front doors will become a window. He said the addition will be diminutive to existing house. Responding to ARC feedback, he said they moved the elevator to the back of the house and added a double gable roof form to hide the elevator shaft, moved the addition back and created a gasket the old and new between. He said to differentiate the addition they will use siding instead of shingles, the railing design will be changed to comply with code and the columns will be square. He said the rockery will be maintained. He said they will add a garage and will be cutting in a driveway and noted there is no alley access to the property. He said they will add skylights on the roof, but they are set back so likely less visible than in the elevation drawing. He said they propose to remove the chimney. He said they have documented and will replicate existing details.

Mr. Murdock asked about the condition of existing building.

Mr. Whitney said it is clear cedar. He said the siding on the south side of the house is in bad shape and they will save as much as possible; it has not been maintained over the years. He said the porch columns and posts are in good shape.

Mr. Kiel asked about window replacement of non-original windows.

Mr. Whitney said they will be Marvin aluminum wood clad.

Mr. Murdock appreciated that the new rail design is inspired by the old rail design.

Ms. Patterson asked about the roof.

Mr. Whitney said they are placing the entire roof.

Ms. Nashem noted that the building is a contributing building in the District as well as a Category 1 building.

Ms. Johnson said moving the elevator to the back made a difference and that she is comfortable with the changes. She said it is subtly new and asymmetrical.

Mr. Kiel said the gable helps a lot. He said the applicant responded well to ARC comments.

Mr. Murdock agreed and appreciated the responsiveness to ARC. He said the house sits high on the site and can only be seen at an angle, not as perceived in the elevation drawings.

Mr. Treffers expressed concern regarding the massing and is not convinced the asymmetrical form is retained. He said there has been a good attempt at differentiating new from old.

Ms. Patterson noted the circular window.

Ms. Johnson appreciated it and said it is the break line between new and old. She said they had previously looked at options in ARC and thought this option helped create a break.

Mr. Whitney said it is the hyphen.

Ms. Patterson said it is a different style but it works.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval alterations and addition per the submittal

This action is based on the following:

The proposed changes are addressed on the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

#### I. STATEMENT OF INTENT AND PURPOSE

##### Purpose and Goals

The purpose and goals of the Harvard-Belmont District are:

- A. To preserve, protect, enhance, and perpetuate those elements of the District's cultural, social, economic, architectural, and historic heritage;
- B. To foster community and civic pride in the significance and accomplishments of the past;
- C. To stabilize or improve the historic authenticity, economic vitality, and aesthetic value of the district;
- D. To promote and encourage continued private ownership and use of buildings and other structures;

##### Guidelines

#### B. Setting

##### 1. General

The height of new buildings and additions should be similar to the heights of adjacent properties so that the relationship of building heights and the land contour remains the same.

##### 2. The Block

Maintain yard space, especially that of front and side yards visible from the street. Front yards should not be used for parking areas. Protect or add trees and landscaping to help reinforce yard edges.

##### C. Individual Buildings

1. Addition or Renovations:

Additions should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is being preserved.

The imitation of historic styles is strongly discouraged, new buildings should be compatible with older structures, especially in terms of other guideline criteria. But they should also be a true product of the present, not a false product of the past.

The exterior materials used for additions shall be similar to exterior materials used in the original building and should be finished in ways that are consistent with the original building.

2. Building Components

Building components should be similar in size and shape to those already in use along the street.

The use of wood, brick and stucco is strongly encouraged in new construction.

Maintaining variety in building materials is acceptable as long as other design criteria are met.

3. Landscaping:

Maintain a clear separation between sidewalk and street and between sidewalk and site.

6. Parking:

Granted parking is a problem in the District. Therefore, a variety of parking solutions may be necessary. Every effort shall be made to limit visibility from the street. Maximize screening of parking when it is visible from the street. When possible the parking should be located to the rear of the building, and access should be limited to a single minimum sized curb cut.

Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

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

MM/SC/RK/JP            7:1:0    Motion carried. Mr. Treffers opposed.

020117.22

Colman School

2300 S. Massachusetts Street

Proposed replacement of select exterior doors

Cindy Huang, Quantum Management, explained that a pair of wood doors are worn out and need replacement. She said they are broken and they can't get similar wood doors so they propose flush metal door, with window to match

size and location of existing, and painted the same color. She said they will keep the frame, and trim and use similar hardware. She said it is the back of the building and not character defining. She said it is affordable housing. She said they narrowed the scope of this project to a single pair of doors and this will have minimal impact. She said they are high use doors and they have deteriorated. The estimate they received to restore doors is much more than they could ever afford. She said their proposal is reversible. They will keep the pair of historic wood doors in the building, so that they can be restored in the future and reinstalled if there is funding available.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if they have done a security review of the entire building.

Ms. Huang said these are the only doors in the building that you can jimmy open; one door is badly torqued.

Ms. Patterson said that given the constraints this is a good solution.

Ms. Johnson agreed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the proposed exterior door leaf alterations at Colman School, 2300 S. Massachusetts Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The applicant has demonstrated that the existing condition is a safety concern for the building tenants. The proposed installation of a new pair of exterior doors within the existing door frame will be undertaken in such a manner, that if removed in the future, the essential form of the historic property will be unimpaired, as per Standard #10 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The pair of existing historic doors will be salvaged and stored within the Colman School building, in the event that they can be properly repaired and reinstalled in the future.
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/KJ/RK            8:0:0    Motion carried.

020117.23

Black Manufacturing Building  
1130 Rainier Avenue S.  
Proposed fence, gate, and security lighting

Kevin Sutton, MZA, explained the proposal to install a fence across the courtyard portion of the U-shaped building; they will also install motion

sensor exterior lighting. He said there will be a lock with a screen so you can't reach through the gate. He said they will put in a post and footing at the end of the building; if this isn't possible it may be necessary to attach to the building masonry. He showed the preferred and alternate details.

Mr. Kiel said this application was approved four years ago and the approval has expired.

Ms. Durham asked if lighting was included then as well.

Mr. Sutton said it was but it has been updated and a different lighting is proposed now.

Ms. Doherty said a certified arborist provided recommendations on how to install the lights and conduit.

Mr. Treffers said they addressed ARC concerns regarding historic materials and after reviewing the arborist report it seems safe to put lighting there.

Mr. Sutton said there are a couple non-historic lights there now; there is no pedestrian traffic here.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if the gate will be locked and if there will be a buzzer to get in.

Mr. Sutton said it will be locked and there will not be a buzzer.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site improvements to the Black Manufacturing Building, 1130 Rainier Avenue S., as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 113601, 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/KJ/JP                      8:0:0    Motion carried.

020117.24                      Medical-Dental Building  
509 Olive Way  
Proposed signage

The applicant provided photos of existing signage on the building and explained the proposal to reface the existing box sign.

Ms. Sodt said it is not black as it is shown.

The applicant said that the sign has more warmth than the photo shows; the silver doesn't look great so they went darker. She said that what is proposed is more in line with the building's era.

Ms. Sodt said that there is a signage plan for the building that focuses on signage for storefronts – blades and silver wall panels.

Mr. Treffers asked if there will be new holes.

The applicant said there will be no new holes; everything they need is there now.

Ms. Sodt said that using the same penetrations is a good idea.

Mr. Kiel said ARC had no concern it was a one for one change out with no impact.

Ms. Johnson said that it will look nicer with a darker sign.

Mr. Murdock said they looked at the signage for this building so many times.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage alterations to the Medical Dental Building, 509 Olive Way, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 122316, 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/RK/JM            8:0:0    Motion carried.

020117.25

Lincoln Reservoir / Cal Anderson Park  
1000 E. Pine Street  
Proposed extension of mural installations at Gate House

In the applicant's absence Ms. Doherty explained the program to provide temporary art installation in niches of blocked-in windows. She said they want to extend the deadline for removing the second installation, and add a 3<sup>rd</sup> installation. She provided photos of gatehouse with murals. She said that the panels are mounted to CMU infill which have blocked the windows since the 1970s-80s to prevent damage. She said the murals are applied over the stucco on the CMU, and they tested the adhesive to minimize delaminating the stucco.

Marcia Iwasaki, Arts, arrived. She said this project was a collaboration with Arts, SPU, DOPAR and DON (HP). She said the images were printed onto vinyl which is non-toxic and won't harm the building. She said the youth who worked on this project as part of an after-school program at Washington Middle School and are primarily from underserved communities - Ethiopian and Somali. She explained the opportunity for the kids to work with teaching artists. Due to SPS's changes to the school day schedule the students' time working on the project was greatly reduced, so they want to extend the program to an entire school year. She explained that the first group of kids wanted to do art that was happy and uplifting, and the second group's focus was more about the struggles and sacrifices associated immigration and finding peace.

Responding to questions she said that the vinyl is tacked up with a heating element. She said that they had to replace two panels because of vandalism with an exacto knife. She said that the art work has lessened the amount of overall graffiti on the building. She said the sign on the door identifies the youth program, school, and students.

Ms. Durham said it was a fantastic project.

Ms. Doherty said many of the kids in the first group had never done artwork before and it was a great opportunity to work with an artist.

Ms. Iwasaki said they provided quality art supplies for the kids.

Mr. Murdock said it is a great project involving preservation, art and community.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board extend the time period for the proposed temporary artwork and interpretive sign on the 1901 Gate House, at Lincoln Reservoir, 1000 E. Pine Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:



1. The proposed temporary installation 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. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/KD/EV            8:0:0    Motion carried.

**020117.3            NOMINATIONS**

020117.31            1515 Broadway

Steve Gillespie explained that South Seattle College owns the property and plans to do affordable housing there.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and neighborhood. She said the building was built in 1912 and had smaller spaces in front with warehouse space in the rear. She said significant changes have been made to the building; storefront removed and moved back to a different plane, auto access altered, spandrel brick covered with wood panel, and there is visible vegetation damage.

She said the building did not have integrity and did not meet any of the criteria for designation. She said the building was not significantly associated with the development of Capital Hill and the Pike Pine corridor. She noted the importance of the auto industry to the neighborhood and showed other auto related buildings that played a more significant role and have more integrity. She said the vernacular utilitarian building has lost integrity and can't convey any significance.

Ms. Durham asked what was between the pilasters.

Ms. Mirro said that the bulkhead is covered under plywood; she said that all the storefronts have been altered.

Ms. Durham asked when they were infilled.

Ms. Mirro said it was in the 1990s.

Mr. Murdock asked about the vehicle ramp.

Ms. Mirro said that what is there is original but that the floor level is raised now.

Mr. Treffers said originally the property was listed as 'auto loft'.

Ms. Mirro said that Ira Harding, the builder, put that on the permit. The owner was a barber. She said it was just a service type store.

Ms. Vyhnanek asked if the cornice is intact and if she knew what was behind the plywood.

Ms. Mirro said that the alley border is in poor condition. She did not know what is behind the plywood.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Johnson did not support nomination and noted there are other significant auto related buildings in the neighborhood; nothing about this building conveys that.

Ms. Peterson did not support nomination and noted loss of integrity.

Ms. Vyhnanek did not support nomination and noted loss of integrity.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support nomination. He noted loss of integrity.

Mr. Treffers said that the building is slightly unique – it was constructed in 1912 a little earlier than others. He said it is a very modest building.

Mr. Murdock said the height and bays are there but there is a loss of integrity.

Ms. Durham did not support nomination. She noted loss of integrity

Mr. Kiel did not support nomination and noted the building can't convey significance.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the building at 1515 Broadway 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/KJ/JP 8:0:0 Motion carried.

020117.32

Eldridge Tire Co. Building  
1519 Broadway

Ellen Mirro prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the neighborhood and site. She said the Spanish or Mission Revival building consists of three bays. The northern and southern bays are enclosed retail spaces, and the central bay is an open porte-cochère allowing cars to access the parking area. The retail bays each have a wall parallel to the sidewalk with a storefront entry, central door and transom above, with two flanking windows with tiled wall below. Original black 4" x 4" tile with a single line of turquoise tile exists under beige paint. Each retail

bay also has a wall angling back towards the porte cochère at a 45-degree angle with a single plate glass arched top window, and a decorative arched tile panel above, now painted over. The sloped roof over the porte-cochère was originally clad with clay tile roofing, and is now covered with asphalt shingles.

She said the building didn't meet Criterion A. She said that it may or may not meet Criterion B. She said the founder, A. S. Eldridge, owned a dealership and sold Buicks, he was active in yachting, was director of motor car club, and was an auto industry developer in Seattle. He closed his dealerships in 1936. She said it may or may not meet Criterion C for its association with Eldridge and the auto industry. Regarding Criterion D, she said the Mission Revival Style building retains its parapet and arches. She noted other area buildings of the style – L'Amourita Apartments, Goodwin Texaco, Durant Starr, Booth (Cornish) building, among others. She said that this building illustrates the everyday style of A. H. Albertson's work whose other works includes the Great Northern Life Building, St. Joseph Catholic Church, and U. W. Law Building among others. She said the building does not meet Criterion F.

Mr. Murdock asked about the bracing behind the porte-cochère.

Ms. Mirro said it is a decorative feature.

Ms. Patterson asked if the service yard has always been open air.

Mr. Ketcherside said there is one similar on Rainier and noted the use of the style for auto related buildings in Los Angeles.

Mr. Treffers suggested "Historic Places Los Angeles" as a good survey example.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the connections between Eldridge and the Metro Building directors.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination and said it is a great example of the Mission Style auto building. He said that kiosk style buildings were associated with auto uses up through the 1950s and are an important part of what the auto was. He noted that the conservation district overlay is not a preservation category – it is a developer thing and not a way to save buildings. He said that the architect is significant although this is not a significant work of his. He said that Eldridge was a builder and this style must have been purposeful.

Mr. Treffers agreed with Mr. Ketcherside. He said that the building has high integrity given its size and opportunities over the years. He supported nomination on criteria C and D with D the stronger criterion.

Ms. Durham supported nomination on criteria C and D. She said it has integrity and noted the Mission Style auto building is worthy.

Mr. Murdock agreed and said it is a small building that sits big; the porte cochère frames the auto entry. He said it is a generous gesture in tight context.

Ms. Johnson supported nomination. She noted its Mission Style was often used for auto buildings. She wondered if its shape and drive-through are unique. She said it is too bad the clay tile is gone.

Ms. Patterson supported nomination on criteria C and D. She said it is a small building with lots of style, ornate for what it was. She said she would like to see more example of use of porte cochère and how this building interacted with Eldridge Motors.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported nomination and said that the architectural style pops and it is a charming building. She said the nice accent tile was painted over.

Mr. Kiel supported nomination, hesitantly. She said that Criterion C is a hard sell and there isn't much there for Criterion D. He said open air service in Seattle is odd. He questioned the significance.

There was agreement to nominate the exterior only.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Eldridge Tire Company Building at 1519 Broadway 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 March 15, 2017; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/RK/ST 8:0:0 Motion carried.

**020117.4 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES**

020117.41 Lloyd Building  
601 Stewart Street  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough explained the request for extension to the first meeting in June. He said they may be able to set up an ARC meeting prior to that.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building, 601 Stewart Street, to the first meeting in June 2017.

MM/SC/RK/JM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

020117.42

E.C. Hughes Elementary School  
7740 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW

Tingyu Wang, Seattle Public Schools, explained the request for a 9-month extension for E. C. Hughes and Loyal Heights, a 12-month extension for Magnolia, and an 18-month extension for Daniel Webster. She said they have not yet received Certificates of Approval for Magnolia or Webster schools and they would like to wait for that.

Ms. Doherty noted that the Landmarks Board recently approved the E. C. Hughes C of A which was primarily tenant improvements with some new windows, and an exterior ramp and lighting. The Board also recently approved a C of A for Loyal Heights, which was a large rehabilitation project and building addition. Magnolia has had a number of briefings to show the development of the proposed building rehabilitation and large addition; she expects the full application to be submitted fairly soon. The Daniel Webster project team recently met with her to discuss early concepts for rehabilitation and an addition.

Ms. Wang said that School District leadership is conducting a review of school buildings that previously have been landmarked to determine impact of landmarked features have had on the district machine and vision. They will not be negotiating Controls and Incentives during that period. She said she hoped the nine months will give them enough time to then come back and re-engage in the C&I negotiations.

Ms. Doherty said it is advantageous for the property owners to complete the Controls and Incentives Agreement before undertaking a large project, as it can reduce the size of an application and limit the time spent coming before the Board.

Ms. Sodt said the standard C&I extension is 3-months.

Board members decided on a 9-month extension for all of the schools so that they can hear an update.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for E. C. Hughes Elementary School, 7740 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW, for nine months.

MM/SC/MM/KJ 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

020117.43

Magnolia Elementary School  
2418 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue W.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Magnolia Elementary School, 2418 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue W, for nine months.

MM/SC/MM/RK 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

020117.44 Loyal Heights Elementary School  
2501 NW 80<sup>th</sup> Street

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Loyal Heights Elementary School, 2501 NW 80<sup>th</sup> Street, for nine months.

MM/SC/MM/JP 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

020117.45 Daniel Webster Elementary School  
3014 NW 67<sup>th</sup> Street

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Daniel Webster Elementary School, 3014 NW 67<sup>th</sup> Street, for nine months.

MM/SC/MM/RK 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

**020117.5 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator