



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 235/17

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday, April 5, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Russell Coney  
Kathleen Durham  
Garrett Hodgins  
Robert Ketcherside  
Jordon Kiel  
Kristen Johnson  
Julianne Patterson  
Matthew Sneddon  
Steven Treffers  
Emily Vyhnanek

### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom

### Absent

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

### **040517.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

March 1, 2017

Deferred.

**040517.2**

**CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

040517.21

Columbia City Landmark District

4820 Rainier Ave. S. – Rainier Valley State Bank

Proposed storefront alterations, paint colors, lighting fixtures, sidewalk furniture and signage.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed storefront alterations for new tenant, Molly Moon’s Ice Cream. Proposed work includes: reconfiguration of the storefront and relocation of the entry door, exterior paint colors, exterior lighting fixtures, signage and a proposed bench, to be adhered to the sidewalk. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. The Rainier Valley State Bank is a 2-story vernacular commercial building constructed in 1922. It is a contributing building located within the Columbia City National Register District. The Columbia City Review Committee received a project briefing on March 7, 2017. Following the project briefing, the Committee recommended the addition of lighting to the script signage above the storefront and discussed paint colors, in light of the adjacent storefronts. Members noted that other buildings with multiple tenants do not have uniform paint colors; they did not object to the color change, as proposed, noting that it’s an existing color on the building. Ms. Frestedt said the Landmarks Preservation Board approved an application for window signage, for a temporary pop-up shop (Alma), at this location in October 2016.

On April 4, 2017, the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee supported the changes that had been made in response to the initial project briefing. The Committee recommended approval of the application, as proposed.

Applicant Comment:

Jennifer DuHamel, DuHamel Architecture, walked through drawing packet with board members and noted the intention to retain as much of the historic character of the storefront as possible. She went over changes that have been made to the storefronts over time, showing historic photos. She said nothing proposed to be removed is original. She said the existing storefront door swings out because the interior floor is higher than the exterior and has a slight ramp. She said they will move the door 3’ south where the interior / exterior grade evens out. She said they will add an inswing door. She said they will add a bench to the left of the door and it will be affixed to the sidewalk. She said they will replace the entire wood storefront, which was not well-constructed, and keep existing non-original brick and infill brick where necessary. She said they will replicate the transom as it is on adjacent storefront, which she believes to be original. They will keep brick surround, paint storefront cream. She said the door will be “Molly Moon blue”. Three signs are proposed: blade sign of dog with ice cream with two bullet lights; ‘ice cream’ sign on piece of bent metal, powder coated orange and affixed to transom; and Molly Moon script font, metal, affixed to frieze where the ‘Subway’ sign was.

Molly Nietzel, business owner, said she is excited to be in Columbia City and this is their eighth location. She said she wanted to be in a historic building and noted her mother was State Historic Preservation Officer for Idaho.

Ms. Frestedt said an alternate color scheme was provided but was not preferred by the applicant or the CCRC.

In response to a question, Ms. DuHamel confirmed that the canopy would not include illumination.

Mr. Treffers asked about attachment methods for signs, bench and lighting.

Ms. DuHamel said the bench will be affixed to sidewalk and signs will be attached using new penetrations. Old penetrations from the 'Subway' sign will be patched.

Ms. Nietzel said they will patch and repair holes left by the 'Subway' sign. She noted they will affix the blade sign into the mortar.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Patterson said it was reasonable.

Mr. Sneddon supported the proposal.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported the preferred storefront color scheme.

Ms. Barker appreciated the in-swing door.

Mr. Treffers appreciated using adjacent transom for guidance. He said there is no negative affect with moving the door. He noted that existing holes are being repaired.

Mr. Ketcherside supported the application.

Mr. Coney said they are going out of their way to restore and respect the building.

Mr. Hodgins appreciated the rebuild.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations, signage and street furniture at 4820 Rainier Ave. S., as proposed. This action is based on the following:

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

**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.

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

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

**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.

**8. Street Furniture.** All elements of street furniture, including but not limited to street lights, benches, trash receptacles, and planters, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board as to their specific compatibility with the District. Street furniture must be appropriately sized and sited to afford generous provisions for pedestrian flow.

**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.

**b. Blade Signs.** Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

**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 Interior's Standards #2, 9, 10**

MM/SC/DB/RK 11:00 Motion carried.

040517.22

Sand Point Naval Air Station - Buildings 26N & 26S

6831 & 6801 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE

Proposed replacement of non-historic windows

Roger Tucker, Environmental Works, said they propose the same manufacturer, style and profile of windows as were recently approved for Building 9. He said the current windows are clunky aluminum from 1999; aluminum cladding was added over the wood frames. He said they will remove the aluminum window sashes and cladding, leave wood frames and re-clad over with a tighter fitting profile. He said the windows are single-hung, one over one sashes and vary in height. He showed dimensioned drawings of original windows, existing, and what is proposed, and said they will match the original profile.

Ms. Barker asked about the glass.

Mr. Tucker said it is a darker glass to get U-values, and is the same as approved for Building 9. The windows are white with screen on bottom half.

Ms. Patterson asked why they were not proposing a divided lite.

Mr. Tucker said it was for visibility and more openness.

Mr. Treffers asked about the sill support and if it could damage the original wood sill.

Mr. Tucker said they are waterproofing and adding intermittent blocking to support; support won't be visible.

Ms. Doherty reported that on March 14, 2017, the Sand Point Architectural Review Committee reviewed the proposal. The ARC indicated that the aluminum-clad wood sashes were an appropriate replacement for the non-historic windows, and consistent with the recently approved window replacement at Building 9. They discussed the potential for creating a simulated divided lite to mimic the original fenestration. However, there were not strong proponents for that approach and the 1:1 sash configuration was noted as preferred. They appreciated that the re-wrapping of the frame would be more consistent with the original window appearance.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Vyhnaneck was supportive.

Ms. Johnson appreciated matching the nearby Building 9.

Mr. Kiel appreciated moving in a more historic direction.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed window replacement at Buildings 26N & 26S, 6831 & 6801 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE.

The proposal as presented does not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 124850, and complies with the Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation, and Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District Design Guidelines as follows:

SOI Standards for Rehabilitation - #9

Relevant District Guidelines for:

### ***BUILDINGS & STRUCTURES***

#### Windows

- Retaining, preserving and in some cases restoring the original historic fenestration pattern (window placement pattern) should be a priority.
- An in-depth survey identifying the condition of the existing window frames and sash should be undertaken prior to any consideration of projects involving the replacement or alteration of window sash or window units.
- Wooden window sash, frames and trim should be repaired by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing deteriorated features or components. Such repair may include the in-kind replacement of those parts that are missing or extensively deteriorated. Consideration may be given to the use of substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility and visual impacts.
- Replacement of historic sash and frame members may be undertaken if it can be demonstrated that the window is too deteriorated to repair and all possible repair and upgrading options have been explored. Replacement sash, pane configuration and frame members should closely match the size and design of the historic sash and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility as long as the essential design and character of the window is replicated.
- In order to comply with current energy code requirements every effort should be made to develop design solutions that do not radically change, obscure or alter primary elevations, character-defining features or materials especially fenestration patterns and intact historic window units. Code compliant replacement sash, pane configuration and frame members should closely match the size, configuration and design of the historic sash and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility as long as the essential design and character of the window is replicated.
- Restoration of an entire missing original window or replacement of an existing non-historic window may be undertaken. Replacement sash, pane configuration and frame members should be based on available historical, pictorial or physical documentation, and should closely match the size and design of the original historic sash and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials

based on technical and economic feasibility assessment (including life-cycle cost analysis) as long as the essential design and character of the original window type is replicated.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/EV/JP 10:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Sneddon opposed.

040517.23

Sand Point Naval Air Station - NE 65<sup>th</sup> Street and 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE

Proposed alterations to intersection and sidewalk

Note: Removal of non-original light fixtures are exempt from review per SMC 25.30.070.B.11.

Owen Kehoe, King County Metro, said the bus route is being altered to enter the district at the central and south entry points, and explained the intersection is too narrow for the bus to turn and they proposed to modify the corner. He said they would remove the light pole on the north side of 65<sup>th</sup> and they will increase the wattage of the lamping across the street.

Bill LaBorde, SDOT, said that it is one of many transit stops and proposed changes will allow them to provide weekend service. He said they will modify the sidewalk on the north of the street, but there is no existing sidewalk on the west side of 62<sup>nd</sup>.

Ms. Doherty said this is at the southernmost edge of the district. She noted there are no buildings on the west side of 62<sup>nd</sup>, south of Building 26, although some day there might be new buildings there.

Mr. Treffers asked if the rock retaining wall is historic.

Ms. Doherty said it is not identified as a feature in the landmark nomination. It appears old but does not know when it was built.

Mr. Kehoe said they will not alter the wall.

Mr. LaBorde said the original design included removing a portion of the wall, but they chose instead to remove the light pole and modify the wattage on light across the street instead.

Mr. Treffers asked if the light pole is historic.

Ms. Doherty said it was installed in the 1990s.

Ms. Patterson asked if there was anything to protect the rock wall.

Mr. Kehoe said there will be a full curb. He noted that they will also install a newly marked crosswalk on 62<sup>nd</sup> at this intersection.

Mr. Ketcherside asked how much traffic there is on 62<sup>nd</sup>.

Mr. Kehoe said there are about 130 vehicles per hour on weekends.

Mr. Ketcherside said that cars could make the turn at a higher rate of speed.

Mr. LaBorde said the road is narrow and it is possible southbound vehicles could go a bit faster.

Mr. Kehoe said there is a stop sign which should prevent turning the corner at a high speed.

Ms. Doherty reported that on March 14, 2017 the Sand Point Architectural Review Committee reviewed the proposal as an informal briefing. The ARC acknowledged that bus loop Option A was appropriate although it would result in alterations to the intersection. They noted that the alterations to the sidewalk did not impact the character of the district. Although the light pole removal did not require their approval, they noted it's loss was unfortunate. King County Metro DOT indicated that the lamping on the pole across the street would be increased to provide required lighting levels. More than one ARC member noted their concerns for pedestrian safety at this intersection; acknowledging that it was not their purview. While they appreciated the design approach to preserve the stone retaining wall, they said they would be willing to look at other alternatives that relocated the light pole within the vicinity. They also suggested that SDOT provide a marked crosswalk. The ARC noted that the application would not need to return to them for review unless there were substantive changes proposed. Two individuals provided public comment noting their concern for pedestrian safety. A representative from Seattle Parks and Recreation asked that the light pole and fixture to be salvaged and stored for future reuse within the historic district. The applicant noted that Seattle City Light was planning to do that.

Mr. Ketcherside supported the application and said it is a needed change and warranted. He said it is a 1940's style intersection that needed to be changed to an intersection of today although it does change the character.

Mr. Treffers agreed and said it affects the character but he understood the need and alternatives were explored. He said that the wall will be retained and the light pole moved. He said to instruct the crew to be mindful and protect the wall.

Ms. Barker said to not get in the practice of kicking up wattage to accommodate removing poles and to think more holistically.

Ms. Doherty said this intersection is right on the south boundary of the district; if this type of proposal was elsewhere in the district it would likely be more of an issue.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed alterations to the right-of-way at NE 65<sup>th</sup> Street and 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE.

The proposal as presented does not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 124850, and complies with the Secretary of Interiors

Standards for Rehabilitation, and Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District Design Guidelines as follows:

SOI Standards for Rehabilitation - #9

Relevant District Guidelines for:

***BUILDING SITES & DISTRICT SETTING***

New Street Work & Sidewalks

- New street improvement work should match the appearance of the existing roadway surfaces throughout the district. Typical surfaces are exposed aggregate concrete or asphalt over concrete. Exposed aggregate concrete is the preferred pavement material within the district.
- New or in-kind replacement sidewalk areas must match the appearance of the existing sidewalk surfaces throughout the district in material and design.
- New concrete work must be specified to match aggregate size, color, and proportion of different aggregate mixes.
- New concrete work must be specified to incorporate colorant as necessary to match the existing/historic adjacent concrete color.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/DB/RK            11:00 Motion carried.

**040517.3            DESIGNATIONS**

040517.31            Campbell Building  
4554 SW California Avenue

Ms. Barker disclosed she participated in a special task force 2014 – 16 regarding the historic property survey and inventory, but did not participate in preparation of the nomination or selection of the consultant.

Neither the property owners or the Board objected to her participation in the proceedings.

Clay Eals, Southwest Seattle Historical Society, introduced the presentation and noted his support of the designation.

Sarah Martin said she would address board questions from the nomination meeting. She said the building meets criteria B, C, D, and F; it is associated with W. T. Campbell and with the initial commercial development of the area. She said it represents the Arts and Crafts style and she noted the strategic siting. She went over context of the building and neighborhood. She said the growth of the area is tied to transportation, specifically the expansion of the street car line. In 1907 two lines met at the junction and a wild real estate boom followed. She reported that the original

drawings by Wilson and Loveless showed a building full length of the lot; half the building was constructed in 1911 and a second building permit for the other half was issued in 1920. Victor Voorhees oversaw construction of the second half but followed the Loveless design pretty faithfully. There have been various tenants over the years and there was a period of combined use with the market building to the north.

She said that William T. Campbell was a teacher, school principal, community booster, realtor, Seattle Councilmember, Skagit Engineering Commissioner, who supported Bertha Landes for mayor rather than running himself. When the Depression hit, he had to sell his properties. The Calvo family purchased the building in 1943 as an investment.

Ms. Martin said that architect Clayton Wilson was best known for municipal buildings; architect Arthur Loveless is better known and rarely did commercial buildings. Victor Voorhees had no formal training in architecture; he is best known for his popular house plans.

She said that the building has two primary elevations with retail at grade. She noted aluminum sash windows in original openings, solid brick piers at the first floor with wood frame and brick veneer construction above, as well as a cast iron cornice. She said the west elevation is symmetrical with brick piers, basket weave brick pattern, arched parapet. She said two storefront spaces were combined and still have the double door entry designed by Voorhees; she said it is prime retail space. She said the horizontal beam was added in 1939. She said the three large display windows are from the Voorhees renovation as well.

She noted there is a 3-sided bay on each end of the second floor. She said there are three storefronts on the east portion; a mid-century angled storefront, and the two easternmost storefronts are original. She said at the rear of the building is ground floor access door leading to the second floor. She said the second-floor functions as it did originally. She said two doorways from the 1930s go into the adjacent building. She said the stairs are u-shape with a landing. Original windows overlook the lightwell. She noted the corridor of office doors and windows and a pair of original bathroom doors on the north wall. She said two buildings share the exit to the alley. She said the building meets criteria B, C, D and F.

Ms. Patterson asked why Campbell had Voorhees oversee construction of the east half.

Ms. Martin said she couldn't find anything about that.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, presented on behalf of the ownership. Using a PowerPoint presentation, she provided photos and renderings of the building; she pointed out and explained changes that have been made. She said aluminum windows are new as is a storefront at street level. She said the entry door was altered; originally it was a double door. She explained that the red line shown on plan is the presumed north lot line of the legal description and noted the confusing structural elements between the subject building and the market building to the north. She said the Arcade Building is three risers up from the Campbell Building and reiterated the confusing boundary.

She said that on Alaska the entry vestibule to the upper floor is smaller and walled in. She said the lightwell windows are there but are blocked in. She said there have been changes to the back-hall stairway. She said the owners support designation of the exterior but not the interior which is too altered, and will impact their management. She said the second floor of the building is open only during business hours.

Sal Cohen, Owner, said they reluctantly support designation and asked that upstairs and hallway not be included; they expect to re-tenant the upstairs and need flexibility.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary, said regarding Criterion D, that no style has been established for the interiors and it would need to embody a style or period. She said that it doesn't meet Criterion E because no interiors are outstanding. She said the Arcade Building is not nominated and the spaces work together; nomination should have happened at the same time because of the weird property line. She said the ownership supports designation of the building exterior only.

Public Comment:

Peder Nelson, Southwest Seattle Historic Society, spoke in support and noted letters of support received from Councilmember Lisa Herbold, former Councilmember Tom Rasmussen, and former Mayor Greg Nickels. Many meeting attendees stood in support.

Brad Christman spoke in support and cited Criterion B for W. T. Campbell, who he called 'Mr. West Seattle' of the day. He said Campbell was involved in all aspects of West Seattle Life – civic leadership, Seattle City Council, transit.

Karen Richter spoke in support and cited Criterion C. She noted the cultural development of the streetcar and this site being at the crossroads of the West Seattle community.

Cody Othoudt spoke in support and cited Criterion D. He noted the red brick, the roof form and bay window. He said the building is an anchor building in the neighborhood commercial district. He said its charm and style are intact.

Leda Costa spoke in support and cited Criterion F and noted the quality and identity of the junction. She said the owners have taken excellent care of the building which welcomes people to the Junction.

Brooke Best, Historic Seattle, supported designation and noted Campbell had a significant impact on the area as developer and civic booster. She said he had a long relationship with the building which is associated with early 20<sup>th</sup> century growth. She said it is one of the oldest structures in the neighborhood. She noted the significance of Voorhees and Loveless. She noted the dark red and brown clinker brick, basket pattern, and cast iron coping. She said the building is intact and has integrity. She said it stands as sentry at a major intersection. She supported criteria B, C, D, and F.

Marcy Johnson spoke in support of designation.

Ralph Maimon, member of ownership group, said they love the Junction. He said a strong case was made to not include the interior. He thanked Staff for not recommending interior for designation.

Kevin Schaps, Campbell Building Property Manager, said not to include the interior – many changes have been made. He appreciated the community support for the exterior.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Durham supported designation based on criteria C, D, F and said it is definitely a local landmark that is connected to the economic heritage and streetcar. She did not support inclusion of interior. She noted a statement that Campbell had a ‘positive feeling about the future’. She was unsure about inclusion of Criterion B.

Ms. Johnson supported designation based on criteria C, D, F and did not support B because his significance was limited to West Seattle rather than the whole city. She said the architectural detail is great and the building looks almost exactly as it did originally. She noted the family ownership and the community support. She noted the roofline and detail. She did not support including the interior.

Mr. Hodgins supported designation on criteria B, C, and D, but for the exterior only. He said Campbell is significant because he shaped the critical intersection in West Seattle.

Mr. Coney supported designation on criteria B, C, D, and F. He noted Campbell named the building for himself and he noted Campbell’s involvement in City Council. He said the building is significant of that intersection.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation of the exterior on criteria B, C, D, and F. He thanked the community for doing the survey and bringing forth the nomination and for the good prep in commenting. He thanked the property owner for providing additional information. He noted the building was named for Campbell who was involved in the community and the city. He said that West Seattle is a region of the City – not a neighborhood – and Campbell was significant in the entire City.

Mr. Treffers supported designation of the exterior of the building on criteria C, D, and F. He thanked the property owner. He noted the interior had been altered.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported designation of the exterior on criteria B, C, D and F. She noted that West Seattle is a region of the larger city and supported the inclusion of Criterion B.

Ms. Barker supported designation and noted the prominent architects involved; she noted how Voorhees followed the Loveless plan. She said that even though Campbell had to sell the building, it still has his name on it. She supported criteria B, C, D, and F. She said the building is iconic and was there before there was a crossroad. She thanked the Calvo family for taking such good care of the building.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation of the exterior. He said the area is a regional development of the larger city. He noted criteria B, C, D, and F. He said there was a 10 to 15-year gap where eclectic style was used.

Ms. Patterson supported designation of the exterior of the building based on criteria B, C, D and F. She said Campbell purchased the lots before annexation and rail.

Mr. Kiel supported designation and cited criteria B, C, D and F.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Campbell Building at 4554 California Avenue SW as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards B, C, D, and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/DB/RK            11:0:0 Motion carried.

040517.24

Campbell Building  
4554 SW California Avenue  
Proposed alterations to exterior awning

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, explained that the existing awning is green and white vinyl and the new one will be all black. They will apply new signage lettering in white, repair the frame and use the same connections. They propose new vinyl fabric. She showed two alternatives for each tenant's name / brand.

Mr. Hodgins noted the photos show no existing awnings.

Kevin Schaps, the building manager, explained the old awnings were recently removed for maintenance purposes.

Ms. Mirro said the building had traditional retractable cloth awnings historically.

Mr. Schaps said the proposed vinyl holds up better than canvas, it is fire retardant, more practical, easier to clean, and looks better longer.

Mr. Kiel said it doesn't detract and vinyl is not a big deal. He said that additional words for each tenant's brand is not a big deal and the new awning proposal is better than the existing one.

Mr. Treffers had no issues with the tenant-preferred lettering, and noted the existing awnings are not the original ones. He preferred canvas to the vinyl.

Mr. Coney and Ms. Barker also preferred canvas to vinyl.

Ms. Vyhnanek was okay with the vinyl if it was not overly shiny. She said the vinyl will hold up better. She noted the tenant preferred text was fine with her.

Ms. Patterson said it is not a permanent change to the building and the vinyl will last longer.

Ms. Johnson agreed the vinyl will last longer and the existing awning was not original to the building.

Mr. Sneddon said it is an in-kind replacement.

Ms. Barker said she would be okay with vinyl and centering the lettering.

Ms. Durham preferred canvas but noted it is an in-kind replacement.

Public Comment:

Clay Eals, Southwest Seattle Historical Society, had no problem with the proposed awning replacement and appreciated the design.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker noted it was a reduction in overall signage as proposed.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed awning alterations at the Campbell Building, 4554 SW California Avenue, as per the attached submittal, vinyl material and tenant-preferred graphics.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in the Report on Nomination (LPB 128/17), 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/DB            11:0:0 Motion carried.

040517.32

Row House Café  
1170 Republican Street

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, explained that the building is a single structure now. He said they are looking into the house next door that was razed. He said this property has been deconstructed twice in the last 20 years.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, said what used to be three cottages is not a single building. She did a virtual walk around the building and noted the changes (for detail see PowerPoint report in DON file); she noted that many of the elements were salvaged from the Re-store. She pointed out changes made during the Neurendorf remodel – new walls and infill between cottages – and further changes made during the Rowhouse remodel. She said roof of the eastern most cottage was reframed; a deck was added and traffic patterns for porches is completely different.

She said the massing and material has changed. She said rooflines alone are not enough to tell the story. She said the remodel confers a sense of false historicism. She said the building does not meet criteria A or B and is only tangentially associated with C. She said the building was identified in original survey by Nyberg and Steinbrueck as a building group and was not included as significant. She said a survey completed by Karen Link identified the building as potentially significant but the building has changed since then.

She said there is nothing to support the Rowhouse claim that it was a neighborhood of ship builders. She said there were a lot of houses for rent in the same price range at this time. She noted the construction of the freeway changed the area and there were zoning changes. She went over surviving housing stock in the area and said there are a few wood frame houses.

*Mmes. Vyhnanek and Patterson left at 6:30 p.m.*

Ms. Mirro said that there are lots of worker cottages all over the city; some were specifically built for an industry but others were built independently. She said the authenticity of the worker housing has been stripped away. She said the building does not meet Criterion D. She said the houses were built by the McFarland family for their use and do not meet Criterion E. The building is not visible and does not meet Criterion F.

Mr. McCullough said the building is not worthy of designation. He said the ‘marine worker’ story was a fabrication and the building(s) house a variety of workers over time. He said the buildings were taken apart and put back together twice. He said that Erin Maher created a fictitious history. He said the typology is that they are detached, which they no longer are. He said the form is not rare, there are lots of this type housing.

Mr. Treffers asked about DAHP comments.

Ms. Mirro said they are too altered. She said they may be valued locally but not from the state or national level. She said she just did a check-in.

Mr. Coney asked about siding replacement.

Ms. Mirro said that Neurendorf put new siding on and Erin Maher took the nicer siding from the back and put it on front.

Mr. Coney asked if the rafter tails are original.

Ms. Mirro wasn't sure.

Ms. Sodt said the rafter tails inside are but the easternmost are not.

Ms. Mirro noted that window heads were lowered and all modified.

Public Comment:

Candy Wilvang, neighborhood resident, said she lives in the neighborhood in low-income housing in a just-designated building. She said that owners in neighborhood houses move out and leave vacant and the squatters destroy them. She said there used to be 250 houses in the neighborhood and now there are just four; she noted photos showing squatters living in two. She said the heart of Seattle has been gutted out. She said the Rowhouse complements the landmark status of the laundry building. She noted the women's workforce and the struggle with worker strikes. She said that workforce housing signifies all of us.

Brent, neighborhood resident, said the Rowhouse reminds him of the houses that were there – old character of neighborhood that is gone. He said the building is evocative of what was there – and there won't be anything left.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said that although changes have been made they were done in the vernacular tradition of these houses – you did what you could with a small budget. She said the other examples shown – Capitol Hill is a completely different neighborhood – and are not so comparable. She said there are several landmarks in South Lake Union that have been demolished and façade-mized. She noted the economic and cultural heritage and that the building embodies the vernacular style. She noted that integrity issue is huge.

Brooke Best, Historic Seattle, submitted a letter (in DON file) and said the buildings form a striking ensemble of what the district was. She said the two former two story residence next door was built in 1898 and conveyed a powerful image. She compared this building to Belltown's Wayne Apartments. She said we need cottages – they are a rare breed that honor workers' class roots.

Jennifer Mortenson, Washington Trust, submitted a letter (in DON file). She noted integrity issues but noted the siding was from the 1980s and has been reused; it is 25 years old. She said it reflects the vernacular character. She said that housing in other neighborhoods is not relevant – there are no other examples in this neighborhood. She said you can't reference a cottage in another neighborhood. She said without the houses you wouldn't know the historic. She supported designation.

#### Board Discussion:

Ms. Durham said the integrity concerns are significant. She said the historic significance is inherent in the building; it is a scarce and representative resource. She noted the lost opportunity of the neighboring building that was torn down. She noted other neglected properties and said now is the time to jump on them. She said a more comprehensive review of vernacular buildings was needed.

Ms. Johnson said she understood the emotions and said it was a shock to come across the building and realize they were houses. She said it is important to recognize the homes of everyday people – not just the wealthy; they tell the story of what lives were like. She said that what is there is three roof lines and the sense that there were three buildings; she wished there was more integrity.

Mr. Hodgins said the structure evokes the past but it doesn't have the integrity to convey significance.

Mr. Coney said the original forms exist – the rafter tails, western porch; the south front and west and east have high degree of original forms. He said although the current operator of the restaurant wants out, and there is a claim that the building will become derelict, likely another operator would be interested in that location, given all the activity in the area. He supported designation on C and D for workforce housing that supported the City. He said that the three together make a statement.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support designation because of the loss of integrity. He said he appreciates worker housing and he thanked the public for their comments. He appreciated Ms. Mirro's report. He noted the demolition of the neighboring house and said that safeguards are not infallible. He said that the survey was defunded and never refunded. He said digital data would provide safeguards that would prevent this type of thing from happening again.

Mr. Treffers said that the building has significance. He said that the surveys identified the building as potentially eligible after they were connected. He said that regarding Criterion C they represent a significant aspect of cultural and economic heritage in the neighborhood. He said that worker housing plays an important role in the history of the area. He said there is enough left to convey Criterion C. He said that NPS cites 'feeling' as designation criteria but noted 'evoking a feeling' is subjective. He said there is enough left to convey cultural and economic heritage of the City. He said the building meets Criterion F; there is nothing the same age or scale. He said that other examples provided were from other neighborhoods.

Ms. Barker compared the building to the Wayne Apartment Building, which is a full building that was moved and changed and dropped down. She said this building had been cottages, then changed to one building and used an engineering firm, then a café. She said that it is now one structure and the one character defining feature is the roofline which conveys the history. She said it is not apple to apples with the Wayne. She said it has significant character and value as a cultural expression but she wasn't sure.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C, D, and F and said the building represents the working-class presence in Seattle that made a significant impact to the economy. He said Seattle was moving to a new industrial economy and was in competition with Portland. He said the area changed from single, male workers to a family place. He said it was a period of remarkable changed and he noted the labor role and impact of the strikes the workers had. He noted the strength of the workers here. He said the tenants are a snapshot of the workers: a bricklayer during the construction boom; a paint sprayer at the Ford plant; a book keeper, elevator operator. He said there are very few representations of this in the community. He said these buildings can tell the story now that they couldn't in 1911. He said the buildings are living symbols of their age and proof of how some lived in small housing. He said they encapsulate the kind of life that was common but practically forgotten. He said the detail still represents the basic style and you can still see the outline which is a connection to the past. He said that all changes are reversible. He said he appreciated Ms. Mirro's extra research but that labor density in 1940 is not the same as labor density in 1910. He said these represent the houses that didn't even have kitchens and it isn't fair to compare them to middle class bungalows. He supported designation on criteria C, D, and F.

Mr. Kiel did not support designation. He said the Wayne is not a good comparison because it was connected to the Regrade and had commercial added. He said this is now one building and it has seen significant change. He said it is now a roof form only. He said the Ordinance is about material and doesn't speak to scarcity which, he said, lowers the bar. He said that surveys are great but his role is to make his own determination. He said that neighborhoods change which is uncomfortable and unfortunate. He said this is a zoning issue which is outside landmark discussion. He said this is a ghost of buildings that once were.

Mr. Sneddon said it is the exact massing and lines are there; if you look at pictures it is recognizable.

Ms. Durham said you can still read the three distinct buildings.

Mr. Sneddon said that the massing, size and openings are the same as the photo; there is a 2' difference.

Mr. Kiel said there is no hint beyond the roofline.

Ms. Durham noted the gable ends, siding, window, hip roof, dormer, fascia boards on porch are original, original tile from bathroom. She said there is definitely evidence there.

Mr. Kiel said it is subjective.

Mr. Sneddon disagreed.

Mr. Treffers said that someone who lived there in 1912 would recognize the buildings.

Mr. Kiel said that is a low bar.

Ms. Durham said it is a tough call and integrity is an issue but it is more than a roofline. She said it is a connection to the economic heritage is significant and it is still there. She said there are enough of other aspects to integrity there. She said that changes have been made have been mostly in kind. She said the building can convey what it is and is represents a unique resource in this neighborhood.

Ms. Barker said the three rooflines convey the significance and can tell their story. She said the scale, massing and form convey what was there and who would occupy them. She said that it can speak to Criterion C.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Row House Café Building at 1170 Republican Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include exterior excluding garage addition.

MM/SC/RC/MSN 5:4:0 Motion failed. Messrs. Kiel, Hodgins, and Ketcherside and Ms. Johnson opposed.

**040517.4            CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES**

040517.41            Mama’s Mexican Kitchen Building  
2234 2nd Avenue  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough said they submitted a package to ARC for review. He requested a six-month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Mama’s Mexican Kitchen Building, 2234 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, for six months.

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

040517.42            Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center  
4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street  
Request for extension

Jack McCullough explained the request for a three-month extension. He said they are marketing the property and there is a high degree of interest.

Ms. Barker said that is the same as requested before.

Ms. Doherty said the owner had thought the property would be listed at this point.

Mr. McCullough said they are getting calls from clients about the property.

Ms. Barker said to counsel clients about vegetation management plan.

Ms. Doherty said three-months is appropriate.

Public Comment:

Colleen McAleer, Laurelhurst Community Club, said they have been patient. She expressed concern about the lack of a vegetation management plan. She said there has been very poor property management and there has been deterioration of the site. She said maintenance should be required before the property is sold and she noted it has been intentional. She said the integrity of the site needs to be preserved.

Ms. Doherty said the Landmarks Ordinance doesn’t give the Board the power to require minimum maintenance.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said she echoed Ms. McAleer’s comments. She said the Friends of Battelle nominated the site. She noted Rich Haag’s attendance at a landmark meeting and said it is rare to have the original landscape architect there. She wished the Landmarks Ordinance had a minimum maintenance requirement so that demolition by neglect wouldn’t happen. She said it is an 18-acre campus. She said she hoped the next owner would do a better job.

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

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

**040517.5        STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator