MINUTES
Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, June 17, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present
Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Robert Ketcherside
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair
Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley
Alison Walker Brems, Chair
Elaine Wine

Staff
Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent
Sarah Shadid

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

061715.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES
May 20, 2015  Tabled.

061715.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL
061715.21 Columbia City Landmark District
Right-of-Way on w. side of Rainier Ave. S., south of S. Hudson St.
Proposed sidewalk repairs and tree pit expansion
Ms. Frestedt explained the application for repairs in the right-of-way to include replacement of paving materials and tree pit expansion. Exhibits included photographs and plans. On June 2, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application and recommended approval of the proposal.

Mr. Stanley arrived at 3:33pm
Ms. Walker Brems arrived at 3:34pm
Mr. Carter arrived at 3:35 pm.

Applicant Comment:

Terry Plumb, SDOT, explained the replacement of the west side of the sidewalk along Rainier Ave. S. between Dawson and Hudson. Mr. Plumb said the sidewalk doesn’t drain now because the curb is higher than the sidewalk. He said they will demo the entire sidewalk and brick pavers and regrade to lower curb to 4”; they will grade from the building out to accommodate drainage. He said they will repave to City standards and install bricks. He said that they will increase the size of the tree pits to new standard. He noted on plan where bricks will be reduced 10-15% due to expanded tree pits. He said the larger tree pits will allow more water to trees and air to roots. He said the duration of work will be there weeks; parking won’t be an issue as the site is near a parking lot. Responding to clarifying questions he said that the areas between the tree pits will be 6 – 8’. He said the pits will be filled with rock mulch (1/4” basalt) that is very compact. It will be ADA-compliant; a cane or wheelchair can function on it.

Ms. Wine asked about the size of the tree pits and if this is intended to be standard.

Mr. Plumb said it will be consistent city-wide.

Ms. Walker Brems asked about the 4” curb.

Mr. Plumb said they have flexibility to vary curb height 4” – 6” depending on conditions; 4” was chosen here to allow drainage.

Mr. Sneddon asked about brick installation.

Ms. Frestedt said they were installed in the late 1970s. She said the proposed bricks are a close match.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mmes. Wine and Barker said it was reasonable.

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 on the west
side of Rainier Ave. S., south of S. Hudson Street. 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 #9**

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

061715.22 Olympic Tower
217 Pine Street
Proposed signage

Action: I move to table the application for Olympic Tower, 217 Pine Street, pending further information requested at ARC.

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

061715.3 **DESIGNATIONS**

061715.31 Daniel Bagley Elementary School
7821 / 7901 Stone Avenue North

Applicant Comment:

Ellen Mirro, Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). She provided context of the site and Greenlake neighborhood. She walked board members around the building via photographs.

She said that the building has integrity; there have been few changes with the most significant being the enclosure of the play court for use as an art room, and the addition of an elevator. She said that seismic work has been done but
more is needed. She said that the building didn’t meet criteria A or B. Regarding criterion C she said that the school is associated with the development of the Seattle School district and the Greenlake neighborhood but in a more general than specific way. She said that this school replaced the North Greenlake School in 1930. She said that it may or may not meet Criterion C. She named the 20 new schools by Floyd Naramore built between 1919 and 1935 and said that this building is a superior example of Naramore’s work because the style took precedence over the budget.

Ms. Mirro said that the building meets Criterion E because Bagley stands out and exhibits an evolution of styles to something more modern. She said that the building is often overlooked but that it may meet Criterion F.

Ms. Wine asked how many of the classrooms are original.

Ms. Mirro said that all original rooms are still used as classroom along with the transformation of play court to art room. She said there are nine upper classrooms, eight lower, and one art room.

Ms. Barker asked if this school has the same interior breathing wall construction as others.

Ms. Mirro said it does.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. He said it was an interesting period taking Revival into the modern age and providing a snapshot of the future. He said that the building has great integrity and lots of interesting details.

Mr. Luoma supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. He noted the Art Deco and Gothic Revival influence and said it is the only one of its kinds as an elementary school under Naramore. He said the style is evident and even the chimney reflects that and is still there. He said that in a holistic sense there are lots of parts of the building that reflect the style.

Mr. Murdock supported designation on criteria C, D, and E and said the building is unique in Naramore’s portfolio of school buildings. He noted the delightful details.

Mr. Stanley supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. He said it is a great example of Moderne.
Mr. Carter supported designation on criteria C, D, and E and the Staff Report recommendations on interior and exterior. He said you don’t see a lot of elementary schools like this, and it is a great example.

Ms. Wine supported designation and inclusion of interiors; she noted that the spaces are wonderful and the classrooms have so much life. She said the classrooms are wonderful spaces and she supported their designation noting the volume and light. She wanted to preserve the character and feel of the classroom.

Mr. Ketcherside said the gym is a unique space with brick ½ wall and girders on top. He noted the original classrooms. He supported designation on criteria C, D, and E.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C, D, and E and said she appreciated the care of the building. She noted that Naramore’s attention to detail has been maintained. She supported inclusion of the classrooms and volumes – tall ceiling and windows, and the hallways.

Ms. Walker Brems supported designation on criteria C, D, and E and said the school stands out in Naramore’s impressive work.

Ms. Wine said there is so much character on the interior intact and questioned how that would be maintained with modern infrastructure.

Mr. Luoma said he did not think the gymnasium is significant. He understood the desire to preserve the classroom and hallway volumes, but he did not think their details were as important.

Ms. Barker noted the classrooms and heights of chalkboards designated at Horace Mann School.

Mr. Murdock said the daylighting is splendid and noted the school is so intact.

Mr. Sneddon said the lighting is an explicit part of the design and noted the intent to create a proper learning environment for children.

Mr. Stanley said he objected to the inclusion of the classrooms and questioned how air conditioning and sprinklers would be added.

Ms. Walker Brems explained that inclusion doesn’t mean it can’t be modified.

Mr. Murdock said it will be reviewed anyway.

Ms. Barker said it is similar to other schools.
Ms. Doherty reminded the Board of educational specifications. She urged the Board to clearly define the areas of control for the interior.

Mr. Murdock said to preserve the corridor or some of the classrooms or maybe on the main façade.

Mw. Wine said they could alter the classroom size without impacting the volume.

There was a detailed discussion about what to include or not include for the classrooms and hallways. The Board was not able to clearly define the features and Ms. Walker Brems noted that it should be defined by Staff in the Controls and Incentives negotiations with the School District.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Daniel Bagley Elementary School at 7821 / 7901 Stone Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site; the exterior of the building; the classrooms and hallways; the meeting room/cafeteria; the central entrance and associated corridor display; and the central stair at the first and second floors.

MM/SC/EW/JM 8:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Stanley opposed.

061715.32 Daniel Webster Elementary School
3014 NW 67th Street

Larry Johnson, Johnson Partnership, prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and of the Ballard neighborhood. He said the parking lot abuts Webster Park. He noted the main entrance and two projecting wings and the rusticated stone and archway that used to be the main entrance. He said the former main entrance as well as many windows was boarded up to facilitate museum exhibits.

Mr. Johnson said that on the west side the orange-ish 1930 brick meets the more purple-ish 1908 brick. He said that the west façade door way to gym has been boarded; he noted the cast stone lintel with abstracted swan. He pointed out the east façade recessed entry and its shadow archway and transom with vertical muntins; he said there is a frieze with flowers and animals. He said an elevator was installed to the right of the main entry.

He said there is a ramp in the basement from the original building to the 1930 addition. He provided a sketch of the building layout and said that the building had been segregated for boys and girls; the fan room separates the
two. He said that a stairway was blocked off and the ceiling lowered to allow floor for gift shop.

Mr. Johnson noted the original skylights, teachers’ lounge, and six classrooms each with associated storage area and some original cabinetry. He noted different newel posts on the west stairway and basic round balusters. He said the floor levels changes between buildings.

He went through photographs of the meeting room and auditorium and noted the proscenium with a sea creature themed frieze. He said the beams are 12 x 26 Douglas fir; he noted the detail on beams, truss, and corbel. He said that the building has been much altered for museum use – stairs added, elevator added, core punched through and restrooms reconfigured. He said that the upper floor in the 1908 has the fewest changes. He said that there are deferred maintenance issues and noted changes to classrooms.

Mr. Johnson said that the building doesn’t meet criteria A or B. He said that many students have attended school here but the association is not significant enough. He said that the building may or may not meet Criterion C with its association to the development of Ballard and the Sunset Hill neighborhood. He said that Ballard had its own municipal government and school district that created a dozen schools. He said that this school, originally known as Bayview, was built just before Ballard was annexed to Seattle. He said that this is the only ‘before incorporation’ school remaining in the city. He said that the building is an amalgam of styles and methods of building. He said that architect Fred Sexton probably started as a carpenter and moved up. He said that the 1930 Naramore addition was eclectic to more stripped-down Moderne with selectively placed embellishment.

Mr. Johnson said that Fred Sexton was born in England and designed residences, and apartments. He designed the landmarked Dr. Annie Russell house. He said that there are many better examples of Floyd Naramore’s work; this one is typical. He said that this is an original eclectic work by Sexton and Criterion E may or may not apply. He said that the main façade is not highly visible but the building takes up almost an entire block and is locally prominent; it may or may not meet Criterion F.

Mr. Luoma asked if it was common to have play areas sunken in the basement.

Mr. Johnson said it was similar to Horace Mann School and thought it might be a way to monitor kids or it’s just an interior play area during inclement weather.

Ms. Doherty noted the interior playrooms in the basement of the Allen School.
Public Comment: Ms. Doherty noted that public comment letters were sent to board members.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine supported designation based on the Staff Recommendation of criteria C, D, and E. She said that the building is eclectic and pulled from different styles. She said it contributes to the body of work in the School District. She said the 1930 addition is significant and doesn’t detract. She supported designation of the whole exterior. She said the building is an outstanding work of Sexton. She agreed with inclusion of interiors and said that the corridor areas are unusually large.

Mr. Stanley supported designation on criteria C and D. He said the building is not an outstanding work of Sexton’s. He said it is eclectic. He agreed with inclusion of the interior and Naramore’s addition and noted the building has been beautifully maintained. He said the rest of the interior is a hodge podge.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. He said it is an interesting addition to schools and is representative of an earlier era. He said that Sexton was from a craft background and the design shows the adoption of earlier ideas and represents an earlier period. He said that Naramore’s addition is more linear surface. He noted the move from wood schools to fire proof buildings. He said that the school is associated with the development of Ballard and is an important marker of the development of Ballard’s Scandinavian immigrants. He noted Naramore’s stripped down Modern addition that matches the 1908 building. He noted the willingness to adopt segregation of sexes. He said the integrity is not pristine but there are some reversible aspects and the building still conveys its style and significance.

Mr. Murdock agreed with Mr. Sneddon and supported designation on C, D, and E. He said it was an interesting hybrid of two schools and he noted the subterranean play area and Naramore’s covered play area. He said the focus was on the local community with maritime and Scandinavian motifs. He said Naramore’s addition was deferential to the 1908 building.

Mr. Luoma supported designation on criteria C, D, and E and on the recommended interior features. He noted the story behind the building, Ballard, and wood frame schools. He noted the funding of the brick schools just before annexation to Seattle and said that was a significant feat. He said that the architecture is eclectic / utilitarian. He noted the stairwells and newels were interesting although simple. He noted the attention to detail. He said the upper floor main hallway and the expression of wood on all doors and trim. He noted how the building was sited.
Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on criteria C, D, and E and the staff’s recommendation for areas of controls.

Mr. Carter supported designation on criteria C, D, and E and the staff’s recommendation for areas of control.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C and D but was not convinced on E although she wouldn’t vote against it if it were included. She agreed with the Staff Report.

Ms. Walker Brems supported designation on criteria C, D, and E and said it was very compelling that Ballard was settled by Scandinavians and that their school was later turned into a Scandinavian museum. She said it is an outstanding work of Sexton’s; she said he could have been an apprentice and then taken the test – he didn’t have to go to school.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Daniel Webster Elementary School at 3014 NW 67th Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the site; the exteriors of the 1908 building and 1930 addition; the 1930 meeting room/auditorium; the 1930 library reading rooms; and the halls and stairs of the first and second floors in the 1908 building.

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

061715.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

061715.41 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a three month extension as the owner continues to pursue development options.

Nathan Rimmer, representing ownership, said they are working to respond to board questions from the last briefing and to do more formal analysis. He said they should have something by the end of July.

Ms. Doherty said the request is reasonable given the size of the project and that they will come back periodically.

Mr. Ketcherside said to look at the timeline for extensions.
Ms. Wine said that more regular check-ins are appropriate because of public comments.

Public Comment:

Colleen McAleer, community member, said she has a concern with the lack of maintenance at the site. She provided photos showing deterioration to designated buildings and landscape, and noted community concerns. She said that shorter check-ins are important.

Ms. Walker Brems said that individuals can call DPD to register complaints, but that the board doesn’t have purview over maintenance.

Ms. Doherty said a second informational site tour is being arranged.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center for three months.

MM/SC/EW/AL 9:0:0 Motion carried.

061715.42 Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building
1525 11th Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for three month extension and said she was comfortable with that. She said they will do a briefing soon.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building, 1525 11th Avenue, for three months.

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

061715.43 White Motor Co. Building
1021 E. Pine
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for White Motor Co. Building, 1021 E. Pine, for three months.

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

061715.44 Pioneer Sand & Gravel Company Building
901 Harrison Street

Ms. Sodt explained that the agreement had been signed.
Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the Pioneer Sand & Gravel Company Building, 901 Harrison Street.

MM/SC/NC/AL 8:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Stanley abstained.

061715.45 The Theodora  
6559 35th Avenue NE  
Request for extension

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary, said they are waiting for DPD process and requested a three-month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for The Theodora, 6559 35th Avenue NE, for three months.

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

061715.5 BRIEFINGS

061715.51 The Theodora  
6559 35th Avenue NE  
Briefing on proposed addition and site alterations

Eli Hardi, Clark Design Group, explained they propose to renovate the interiors to create dwelling units with additional residential wings to the east and west on existing south parking lot. He said they will create accessible entries on NE 68th Street and 35th Street. He said they will revitalize existing landscaping and create south amenity courtyard. He went through existing conditions and materials. He said they looked at options: 1) add new building masses to existing west wing; 2) a single bar addition in the south parking lot; and selected 3) break bar into two extensions/wings with more usable exterior space. He said the addition will be stepped back and they will infill the deck to create an enclosed elevator lobby – it is currently used as a trash enclosure. He said they want to enclose with the same wood material and glass. He said they will create a better lobby. He said they propose to infill the first story deck to create a leasing office; it will provide eyes on the street and will still function as a deck.

He went over proposed “floating stair” details and said they would be a pedestrian access point. He said it will be a clean concrete stair with transparent glass guard rail. He said the historic planter is below. He said that on the north side they will create a friendlier access which better meets land use requirements. He said they will cut the single long brick wall in the middle to create access point; there will be multiple entrances to the building.

Ms. Barker asked if there is an alley.
Mr. Hardi said that it runs parallel to 35th and dead ends into the site. He noted the gasket between the two buildings and they use of glass as ‘transitionary’ material. He said they propose wood siding, bronze metallic look, and alternative lap siding for differentiation.

Jeff Woodis of Brumbauh & Associates, landscape architect, went over the site and planting plans and said that out of 60 existing trees there are nine classified as exceptional. He said that they propose removal of some sickly, unsightly trees and noted that 44 will remain. He said they are preserving the majority of the trees and changing the understory planting. He said they propose to create spaces for gathering – BBQ, raised planters, pervious pavers. He said they propose to remove a portion of the existing brick wall at the north entry. He said that the propose path, recessed and wall lighting. He said that eco stone, permeable pavers, gravel paths and concrete with cut joints are proposed as is a trellis feature. He said the green factor score is 0.6, and meets the minimum requirement.

Mr. Hardi explained that the north dining space, atrium, fireplace and lounge are designated. He said that in the kitchen area they propose to add two units and two units to the lounge area as well. He said that they propose to remove the veneered bookcases. He said that they propose to remove debris from the atrium and replace the glass roof in-kind; the central planter and brick floor will remain. He said existing signs will remain and they propose to add a marquis sign at the northeast corner with palette in line with building design. He said that a secondary sign at the pedestrian entrance and north entrances will have low profile.

Ms. Barker asked about driveway entrance on 35th.

Mr. Hardi said they will use existing driveway.

Ms. Barker asked how the vehicles get parked.

Mr. Hardi said they will create an opening in the foundation wall to connect to the existing parking lot. He said the garage is shielded by existing planters.

Ms. Barker said it feels different from the rest of the garage area.

Mr. Hardi said that the cars will actually be oriented differently than shown in the rendering. He said that originally they approached with more of a green screen – it cut off connection between the two. He said that it will have a more of a floating look and low plantings will help screen vehicles.

Ms. Barker asked how to get from the new building to the courtyard.
Mr. Hardi said you go to the common hallway and out.

Mr. Carter asked about seismic and if they are doing new plywood sheer walls.

Mr. Hardi said they are not doing plywood sheer walls; they will combine two cells to create a single unit. He said they are closing up doorway and lengthening base. He said they will add a layer of plywood sheathing to the roof membrane.

Mr. Murdock noted calmer elements on projecting porch.

Mr. Hardi said that there are some vertical elements – existing railing and existing stucco guard.

Ms. Barker asked if they plan to keep the glazing screen.

Mr. Hardi said they will and they will remove moss.

Mr. Luoma asked if the smaller east and west entrances will be private.

Mr. Hardi said there will be unrestricted access; it is a massive site and they want to keep the circulation.

Mr. Luoma asked why two smaller signs at east and west are needed – if someone is going in they likely know where they are going.

Mr. Hardi said that the sign was there historically but is likely not needed.

Mr. Luoma said the interior floor space has a rustic look and looks dark.

Mr. Hardi said they don’t want to over light and want to keep a level of intimacy. He said they will bring in new textures – non-institutional. He said the existing floor tiles – 12 x 12 stick down asbestos – are original.

Mr. Stanley asked if they have renderings that show neighboring buildings.

Mr. Hardi said they did height studies.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Doherty asked if any of the exceptional trees would be removed.

Mr. Hardi said no.
Ms. Doherty asked if they plan to salvage and reuse the brick in the new wall, or use new brick.

Mr. Hardi said they will likely use new brick rather than salvage.

Ms. Walker Brems said she wanted to see a clearer site plan and noted the existing buildings to the south and the library to the north. She agreed with Mr. Luoma that signage is not needed at two of the access points and said she would appreciate less signage. She said she likes what was proposed.

Ms. Wine said she was pleased with the evolution of design; she noted the continuous plinth and openness along the base. She said she wants to see more context of the neighboring buildings. She said the design complements the landmark building and enhances the site. She said opening the entry to the north is good – it is more approachable. She said that the interior modifications around the fireplace are truncated. She said it is an unusual fireplace and the new corridor around it is too narrow – she said they aren’t there yet and need to further study that area.

Mr. Murdock said the fireplace looks odd – with no space oriented toward it. He said there is strong A-B-A-B-A rhythm along the east elevation of the existing building, and setting the new building flush with it could cause an unhappy connection. He said he wanted to see the new addition setback. He noted the projecting planes and enclosing the porch and said the changes are solid. He said the lower portion planters are less noticeable than the green screen. He said he was not sure the projecting balconies will read as transparent. He agreed with opening up the north entry but noted that they should retain a bit more and narrow the opening.

Ms. Walker Brems said the fireplace is odd and isn’t really usable in the hallway they propose to building around it.

Ms. Barker recommended looking at the landscaping plan with regard to screening cars. She said she is ok with the glass gaskets, the infill in lobby, and the open wall at the north end. She said she likes the relationship, but to make it reasonable.

Mr. Luoma said where they are redesigning the north end walls the design is overly complex and could still be brick material but it seems distracting. He said to be more subtle and if possible to reduce the amount of wall they are taking away. He said for the most part they have done a good job. He said they now show the driveway on 35th as a simple concrete scoring, which is better than the previous stamped concrete. He said they had reduced the number of materials so there is not too much new being introduced. He said the landscape is revitalized and the plant material substitution is successful. He said people like sun and there is no need to provide a lot of shade.
Mr. Murdock said the wall always seemed separate from the structure, and now it is really tied in where the new portions fold inward. He said the wall should feel independent of the building’s post and beam structure and not aligned with the structural grid.

Ms. Walker Brems wondered what the neighbors think – the building always fit in with the residential scale and now at the southeast corner there will be a tall blank wall next to a single story house. She suggested being a good neighbor and adding some vines or some other means of mitigation.

Mr. Hardi said that the existing blank wall was set back. He said there is no formal neighborhood design review required, but he said they have met with the Ravenna-Bryant neighborhood council.

Jessica Clawson said it is part of SEPA.

Ms. Walker Brems said there would be an unhappy neighbor with good reason. She said that the development has always fit in so well and suggested some of these things be addressed. Ms. Walker Brems said that the proposed wood grain texture on the cementitious lap siding is fake, and should have a smooth profile instead.

Mmes. Barker and Wine agreed.

Ms. Wine said she supported the thicker siding profile with no texture. She asked about the trim.

Mr. Hardi said casement windows are proposed for the new addition, and that there are sliding windows in existing building. He said those vinyl windows were installed in 1993.

The Board supported new sliding window sashes to be more consistent with the existing building’s appearance.

061715.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator