



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 98/19

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday February 6, 2019 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Manish Chalana
Kathleen Durham
Rich Freitas
Alan Guo
Jordon Kiel
Kristen Johnson
Steven Treffers

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Garrett Hodgins
Russell Coney

Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

020619.1

MEETING MINUTES

October 17, 2019

MM/SC/KJ/DB

7:0:0 Minutes approved.

020619.2

SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

020619.21 4204 Washington Ave W

Ms. Nashem provided before and after photos of completed work; she said the submitted and eligible costs are \$1,971,747. She said that work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board; interior work which did not require a Certificate of Approval.

Mr. Chalana arrived at 3:48 pm.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 4204 Washington Ave W, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/DB/KJ 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Chalana abstained.

020619.22 4206 Washington Ave W

Ms. Nashem provided before and after photos of completed work; she said the submitted and eligible costs are \$1,613,248. Work was performed in conformance with Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board or interior work which did not require a Certificate of Approval.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: 4206 Washington Ave W, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

MM/SC/KJ/RF 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Chalana abstained.

Mr. Kiel reported to the audience that the Most Worshipful Prince Hall Grand Lodge designation review, scheduled for today, was postponed.

020619.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

020619.31 Troy Laundry Building
311-329 Fairview Avenue North
Proposed signage

James Parr, TubeArt, proposed installation of a non-illuminated pedestrian-oriented directional sign on Thomas Street for Amazon Go. Responding to clarifying questions he explained other dots on the plan were other sign locations for Amazon Go and not on landmark.

Ms. Barker asked if the orange sign on Fairview or Thomas is on this building.

Mr. Parr said he didn't know and would check. He said one sign has been removed since this plan.

Ms. Barker asked if drawing is current and if this is only for the sign on Thomas.

Mr. Parr said all other signs have been installed; this is for the one on Thomas only. He said installation will not go into any brick.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage at the Troy Laundry Building, 311-329 Fairview Avenue North, on Thomas Street side of Troy Laundry.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed change does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 118047, as the proposed exterior alterations and interior alterations are compatible with the massing, size and scale and architectural features of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

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

020619.32

Nathan Eckstein Middle School
3003 NE 75th Street
Proposed exterior sunshades

Mr. Kiel recused himself.

Ms. Doherty said ARC saw a briefing and provided positive feedback.

Paul Dorn, Rolluda Architects, explained the need for sunshade devices for classrooms along the south elevation; he noted heat gain from windows and glass block. He said interior window blinds are not adequate and proposed fixed exterior sunshades. He indicated placement on the drawings and explained installation details. On the south, sunshade will be installed above glass block in continuous manner in 6' and 8' sections, standing out 4" from the building face; material is aluminum, with a Kynar painted finish. On the north, shades will be installed in two-tiered fashion in 6' and 8' sections with different mounting; lower tier will run to beam proud of façade and attached to vertical columns. He provided a photoshopped rendering. He said where there is brick veneer, they will remove it, salvage and reinstall it. He said they need to install mounting plates behind it. They will line up with vertical joints every 6' – 8'. He said one brick will have to be cut to accommodate the plate extensions. He explained they have done a series of shadow studies to prove it is an effective solution. He provided photos of similar sunshades

on other buildings including some of the same vintage. He said he has seen full façade screening, but added their proposed solution keeps the aesthetics of the building and the horizontal banding. He went over spec sheets and noted 6” outrigger that slims down to 4” at the fascia. He provided color samples of the Kynar finish.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said ARC saw briefing of the project.

Ms. Johnson said the work is on the back facades; the design works well with the building’s horizontality and is in keeping with the architectural style.

Mr. Freitas said it is a compatible alteration materially and in nature of intervention. He said it is a small sacrifice and a good solution.

Ms. Barker noted that the intervention is site-specific to Eckstein style and material.

Mr. Chalana asked if it is reversible.

Mr. Dorn said where fastened to exposed concrete repair will be easy; there will be one sliced brick for each steel plate, but it is otherwise reversible.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations at the Nathan Eckstein Middle School, 3003 NE 75th Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior sunshades do not adversely affect the designated features or characteristics, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, 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/RF/KJ 7:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Kiel recused himself.

The following item was reviewed out of agenda order.

020619.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

020619.41 Roy Vue Apartments
615 Bellevue Avenue East
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the owners have requested a four-month extension; she noted they have started the negotiation process, she has sent a draft, but still desires to add specific landscape language.

Ellen Mirro, The Johnson Partnership, said they are hoping to develop a comprehensive stewardship plan. She noted there are issues with the garage and they will come back to brief the board.

Ms. Barker asked what the plan is for – condos? Maintenance?

Ms. Mirro said they are looking at goals for the building and how to meet those within the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. She said there are issues with structural integrity of garages. She said they have been coordinating on other maintenance and in-kind items with Ms. Doherty.

Ms. Barker asked about plans for landscaping.

Ms. Mirro said they have to come up with a plan using best practices; they need time to do all this.

Mr. Kiel said it makes sense to have a clear idea.

Ms. Barker said she is glad they are bringing it up; it has been suggested with other buildings.

Ms. Mirro said there is general maintenance as well – they plan to re-roof.

Ms. Doherty noted the membrane roofs at garage ends, mechanical equipment, etc. can be done administratively.

Mr. Chalana said the exterior only was designated.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of the Roy Vue Apartments, 615 Bellevue Avenue East, for four months.

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

020619.33

Franklin Apartments

2302 Fourth Avenue

Proposed Preliminary Design for development

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, explained this is Phase 1 of a three-year process. He said they are asking for preliminary Certificate of Approval for massing. He said ARC asked about building security; there were breaches to building to the north and other two buildings. He said they secured all openings and entrances in north buildings. He said there has been some clean up, and broken windows on the 3rd floor. He said they will repair.

Ms. Barker asked about courtyard.

Mr. McCullough said that some trash had been removed. He said there are barrels there containing soil samples for testing; they will remain on site. He said the MUP has been issued and the buyer wants to get permits going.

Jeff Walls said three options were presented to ARC for review; ARC wanted to preserve all facades and preserve residential use. He proposed a tower off of the building and to use the Franklin roof as amenity space.

Mr. McCullough said they used ARC guidance in design.

Mr. Walls said ARC wanted more windows at corner. He said they will clean up damage to existing building. He went over window types, sizes, and said there is different patterning in the alley. He proposed residential at street level – loft units. He proposed retail on new portion of the street front. He said a paseo will connect 4th Avenue to alley; light well in Franklin will bring light in.

Mr. Freitas asked if the paseo is continuous through to new building, what the skylight reference is, and is the lightwell being filled in.

Mr. Walls said the skylight is a reference to the lightwell. He said the majority of apartments are in the Franklin, with roof terrace; lightwell goes down and floods into paseo. He said there will be zero new penetrations, they will keep the existing entrance, and glass pieces on roof are not visible from pedestrian / street level. He said they will retain three façades and demolish alley side only.

Mr. Kiel asked the structural system of the Franklin.

Mr. Walls said it is URM.

Mr. McCullough said they are rebuilding the interior.

Mr. Walls said they will short up the building on three sides, demolish floor and roof and tie into new structural system.

Mr. Treffers asked what is being retained.

Mr. McCullough said they are retaining three façades, entry lobby, and walkway up 4th; all are usable. He said the core will come out.

Ms. Barker said the uses retain same window planes with floor levels; no walls will interrupt windows.

Public Comment:

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle, said he was on the Board when this started, and they have come a long way. He appreciated maintaining the character of the building. He said the building was constructed in 1918 as high-quality worker housing and it should be kept as 38 units of worker grade housing. He said they are giving up a lot in the interest of underground parking and raising market values. He said the Ordinance embodies the Secretary of Interior Standards and following them; this doesn't follow them. He appreciated the level of effort put out in design. He said the building is deteriorating but it still has amazing integrity and noted wood doors and marble landing. He encouraged rehabilitation and preservation. He said he walks by this building all the time and he doesn't support what is proposed.

Mr. Kiel said there are special circumstances with the parking. He said a 'façade-job' is not standard but because the tunnel is below, ARC was willing to entertain this approach. He said the tunnel prevents the building next door from having parking.

Mr. McCullough said they did a study and they are under-parking this building.

Ms. Barker asked if that is based on marketing.

Mr. McCullough said to attract capital they have to have enough parking.

Ms. Johnson said the give is there is parking beneath. What is maintained is a strong sense of the original use of the building, unlike what has happened on Capitol Hill. She said you have the feeling of the building. It is unusual that all interiors go away; it is a trade-off.

Mr. Freitas said having parking underneath requires removal of the interior.

Mr. Chalana said it is either maintain interiors or have parking.

Mr. McCullough said the only way to take care of the building is to do the tower or the Franklin will just sit there. They can't do the tower without parking – they can't get financing.

Mr. Kiel asked the number of stalls.

Mr. McCullough said there will be 170.

Ms. Barker asked what was designated.

Ms. Sodt said the exterior.

Mr. Freitas appreciated the addition is not on top of the Franklin; he was OK with what was proposed given the history. He said ideally the interior would be preserved. He said the interiors weren't designated so SOI don't apply; he said he can't make an argument.

Mr. Chalana said it seems a lost opportunity; the entire form and mass are being maintained yet being gutted. He said it meets the letter of the law but not the spirit. He said it loses affordable housing and microunits it has now. He said it is nice to have layers; the mind, soul, spirit, and the gut of the building are being removed for parking. He wanted to see some trend-setting – keep the building and tower. Parking is not required by Code.

Ms. Barker said Code is one thing; banks are another. She said she appreciated how far it has come. She said she didn't appreciate the existing zoning code and the financial requirement for parking because you end up with a gutted building. She suggested better securing of building and to look at opportunities to get into landmark still – where the wall ends. She said the building is still left unprotected.

Mr. McCullough said they could board it up.

Ms. Barker said with demolition of the interior, they will retain original windows, doors and sashes. She said she would love to see shoring be only from the interior, no repeat of the Seattle Times monster supports.

Ms. Sodt said there is no permit until they have the final Certificate of Approval.

Ms. Barker appreciated the tower being off the landmark. She said to keep residential, not retail; pay homage to the landmark.

Mr. Treffers said he was torn. He said it follows the letter of the law, but the spirit is lost. He appreciated the tower being off the landmark. He said there has been a lot of consideration; the building has to bear the brunt of the tunnel and parking and it is giving everything. He noted the Seattle Times Building and the REI – Kelly Springfield building. He said he is seeing the image of a façade and feels the landmark is reduced to a wall. He said it reads as it was with the tower next to it, not on top. It follows the letter of law. He said his hands are tied, there are no other options; he is not excited about approving. He they say it is hard to secure the building; they can cut, shore, build. With the amount of investment, it is hard to believe the building can't be secured; this much money, time, effort and they can't secure the building.

Ms. Sodt said it is frustrating, but it is her understanding that they are only required to secure the first floor. She said that was the problem with Seattle Times Building.

Mr. Kiel said it is a dubious reading of law.

Ms. Sodt said they need to secure higher up because the windows are accessible from the roof of adjacent building.

Ms. Durham agreed. She said no tower on top is huge compared to what else the board sees. She said from the right of way it reads as its own building; the interior should have been designated. She said she preferred more affordable small apartments inside, but it is a win that they are saving appearance. She said it is not perfect, but it is a win.

Ms. Barker appreciated inclusion of fire station datums.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed Preliminary Design of building rehabilitation and partial demolition at the Franklin Apartments, 2302 Fourth Avenue, as per the attached submittal. This action is conditioned on the submittal, review and approval of a Final Design Certificate of Approval.

This action is based on the following:

1. In regards to *SMC 25.12.750 A*, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significance change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in the Designation Report*: While the proposal includes partial demolition, no addition on top of the building is proposed, and therefore the primary elevations and view of the building will not be adversely affected by the proposal.

2. In regards to *SMC 25.12.750 B, The reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner:* The applicant has responded positively to feedback provided by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to explore the compatibility of the design of the adjacent new construction with the historic building--the design has evolved to incorporate ARC feedback.
3. The other factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C and 25.12.750 D are not applicable at this time in the process.

MM/SC/RF/DB 6:2:0 Motion carried. Messrs. Treffers and Chalana opposed.

020619.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES *continued*

020619.42 Bricklayers Building
318 Fairview Avenue North
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for three-month extension and noted it is typical.

Eric Tweit, SDOT, said it is being used for Center City Connect Streetcar for expansion of the maintenance facility. He said they assumed they would demolish the building so need time to work on design concepts. The building is being leased out and is not empty.

Mr. Kiel said it is reasonable.

Action: I move to defer consideration for Controls and Incentives for the Bricklayers Building, 318 Fairview Avenue North, for three months.

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

020619.5 DESIGNATION - *POSTPONED*

020619.51 Most Worshipful Prince Hall Grand Lodge
306 24th Avenue South

Mr. Kiel said the designation is being postponed due to unusual circumstances.

Ms. Doherty said that the nomination was presented by Ellen Mirro of The Johnson Partnership on behalf of her client DEP Homes, the applicant. The building is owned by the Prince Hall Masons. She said DEP Homes was designated by the Mason's as their representative for the nomination/designation process. But after the nomination, DEP decided they would not purchase the property. Ms. Doherty said that when she heard about this earlier this week she reached out to the Masons' leadership and discussed the problem with the them. The Prince Hall Masons would like to request a continuance for three months. Ms. Doherty said that staff supports this proposal.

Mr. Treffers asked what it means.

Ms. Sodt said that it does not terminate the proceedings. She said the Masons were put in a very difficult position.

Ms. Doherty said it wasn't fair to the Masons to ask them to present the designation at this time.

Ms. Johnson said it is reasonable to give them more time. She asked who the responsible party is now.

Ms. Doherty said the Masons are, but they are still sorting through everything.

Mr. Treffers asked what happens if they don't proceed.

Ms. Sodt said that in the past the City has given presentations if necessary.

Ms. Doherty said that additional time is needed and this is uncharted territory. She said she suggested three months.

Ms. Barker asked about notification of the public.

Ms. Doherty said she sent an email out to the board, owners, and the landmarks distribution email list. She said SDCI has the nomination report; the building can't be altered without the Board's approval. She said that information will be added to the parcel.

Ms. Barker asked about security.

Ms. Doherty said the Masons still occupy the building.

Mr. Chalana said it is fine as long as the building is in use.

Ms. Sodt said that it is important that the board makes the decision and not staff and that if the board determines this is the desired action, a motion will be needed.

Action: I move to grant a three-month continuance in designation hearing / proceedings for Most Worshipful Prince Hall Grand Lodge, 306 24th Avenue South.

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

020619.6 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator