



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 30/24

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall, Room L2-80

Hybrid Meeting

Wednesday, February 21, 2024 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Lawrence Norman

Katie Randall

Becca Pheasant-Reis

Harriet Wasserman

Staff Present

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Genna Nashem

Melinda Bloom

Board Members Absent

Matt Inpanbutr

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Marc Schmitt

Padraic Slattery

Vice Chair, Roi Chang called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

ROLL CALL

022124.1

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

022124.2 MEETING MINUTES

December 6, 2023

MM/SC/HW/BP

6:0:1

Minutes approved. Ms. Caton abstained.

December 20, 2023

MM/SC/KR/TC

6:0:1

Minutes approved. Mr. Barnes abstained.

022124.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

022124.31 Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building

103 Pike Street

Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a four-month extension.

Ian Morrison, McCullough Hill said they are exploring reasonable economic use while fielding lots of questions from the public. He said they hope to get responses back this month.

Ms. Chang said it is reasonable.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of the Hotel Elliott/Hahn Building, 103 Pike Street, for four months.

MM/SC/DB/KR

7:0:0

Motion carried.

022124.4 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

022124.41 947 Harvard Ave E.

Harvard-Belmont Landmark District

Proposed demolition includes existing rockery and planting, existing concrete elements including driveway, north stairs off driveway, east stairs from sidewalk, and entry path. new landscape elements constructed will include: concrete and steel retaining walls, concrete stairs with handrail, path, and entry steps, concrete driveway, steel stairs with handrail, new planting areas and trees, to be of significant size, new irrigation and lighting system, new trash/recycle enclosure, and new electric car charger.

Ms. Nashem explained the house was built in 1939. Though the guidelines say grade should be handled by contouring the land, typical front yards in Harvard Belmont include retaining walls, typically of brick, rock or concrete, metal transparent fencing and extensive planting. The arborist report for the diseased tree proposed to be removed is included in the submittal. The code only requires a Certificate of Approval

for landscaping visible from the public right of way, therefore only the landscaping of the front yard is being reviewed. There is no proposed alteration to the planting strip between the sidewalk and the street.

On January 3, 2024, Merrily Chick of the Harvard Belmont review committee and staff conducted a site visit. Ms. Chick submitted a letter stating her concerns about the project including the use of the metal for the retaining wall. ARC reviewed the application along with Ms. Chick's comments on Feb 16, 2024. They requested the applicant add a section drawing, add photos of what the wall might look like with the plants in front of it, and growing over it, revise the drawing of the plantings and consider an alternative to the metal retaining wall.

Dorothy Bothwell, landscape designer explained the proposed landscape improvements including concrete and steel retaining walls, concrete stairs with handrail, path and entry steps, concrete driveway, steel stairs with handrail, new planting areas and lawn, new irrigation and lighting system, new trash/recycle enclosure, and new electric car charger. She said the rockery makes the driveway too narrow and not functional for their needs. The stairs and concrete need to be replaced and plants are overgrown. She said the Cedar tree in front is sick and needs to be removed. She proposed to create a better entry, driveway, and functionality and safety. She showed existing conditions. She noted adjacent neighborhood walls are an eclectic mix of types with walls right up against the sidewalk. She proposed greenery at the sidewalk edge at this site.

She proposed removal of all landscaping elements – plants, rocks, driveway, rockery, concrete. She said the garbage enclosure would have a green roof and enable the garbage to be tucked away and not visible. She noted the sloped planting wall with steel panel in front. She said steps would be moved to the south side of the property, making a more direct route into the house. She went over details on rendering, noting the lawn and plantings. She said mature plants would be put in for immediate effect. The English Laurel would be removed and replaced with Boxwoods. She said the space would be navigable for all.

Ms. Bothwell proposed an 18" fence in front to keep dogs off plantings. She said low voltage lighting would be incorporated. She said stairs would be on both sides of the property, new plants in front of steel wall. She said the steel ties into elements on the house and the wall serves as a backdrop to plantings. She showed examples of retaining walls with plantings in front and creeping over them that soften the look. She said Pacific Northwest planting style with some flowering varieties is planned. She said beneath the floating stairs they will add soil and plants and handrails will be simple.

Mr. Barnes asked what the rail finish would be.

Ms. Bothwell said it would be powdercoated as shown in images. She said it would be a matte finish. She said that metal would refer back to house elements.

Ms. Chang appreciated the presentation. She asked when the other renovation when the steel framing was added was done.

Ms. Bothwell said there is a lot of steel framing in the back of the house. It was likely done in the last five years as part of the Olson Kundig renovation.

Ms. Nashem noted that only items visible from the public right of way are under the jurisdiction of the board so the remodel to the back of the house was not reviewed.

Ms. Chang asked how much wider the driveway would be.

Ms. Bothwell said a foot on each side would be gained.

Ms. Wasserman said ARC reviewed and asked that the 'big blob' of metal be minimized. She said the applicant has done a good job of minimizing it with plantings. She asked if more trees would have to be planted when the one is removed.

Ms. Bothwell said that one is coming out, but more than one are going back in.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated that mature trees were going back in. She said she understood the Cedar must come out. She said ARC had no problem with the concrete. ARC just didn't want metal to take over and that has been solved.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said she was more open to the concrete. She noted there were many other types of walls in the district.

Ms. Bothwell said there are lots of brick and concrete but noted the historic district edge was not clearly defined to know what locations were in the District.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked if any other better suited materials were explored.

Ms. Bothwell said the clients preferred the metal and they thought the finer detail goes better with the house. She said brick was explored.

Ms. Wasserman noted the challenge of trying to match brick. She said the black metal connects to the black components on the house. She noted the character of the windows and said the back panel ties into the proposed black steel.

Ms. Chang noted a letter of public comment was received and asked about the use of metal for the retaining wall versus concrete and she was glad it was discussed.

Ms. Nashem explained that the letter was from Merrily Chick who is a member of the local review committee. She summarized that Ms. Chick's concerns were wanting mature plants to be used and concern for the use of metal for the retaining wall.

Ms. Wasserman said she supported the application and that the team did a good job of considering everything. She said the design minimized the modern look that the metal could have had. She said the design made the landscape functional.

Ms. Randall said the house has a darker palette in general than its neighbors. She said the plants help the wall fade to the background makes it not so jarring. She asked how this house is categorized.

Ms. Nashem said she believes the building is a category 2 or 3 building. It is not a category 1.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said she was concerned about adding metal to the palette on the street because the guidelines call for the use of more traditional materials such as wood, brick or stucco. She said she was concerned it could encourage use of this material elsewhere and set precedent which we may not want to encourage. She noted the improved safety of the steps and noted the lush plants would create some value to the character of the District.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for demolition of existing rockery and plantings including a diseased tree, existing concrete elements including driveway, north stairs off driveway, east stairs from sidewalk, and entry path.

Landscape elements constructed will include:

- Concrete and steel retaining walls
- Concrete stairs with handrail, path, and entry steps.
- Concrete driveway
- Steel stairs with handrail
- New planting areas and lawn
- New irrigation and lighting system
- New trash/recycle enclosure
- New electric car charger,
- as proposed.

This action is based on the following:

District ordinance, the Harvard Belmont Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

Guidelines/Specific

2. CRITERIA AND VALUES

A significant number of buildings within the Harvard-Belmont Landmark District individually embody distinctive characteristics of early twentieth century eclectic residential architectures. These buildings and the mature landscaping which forms their backdrop, collectively create a contiguous streetscape and a neighborhood that are compatible in terms of design, scale, and use of materials.

B. SETTING

Guideline:

1. General
Guideline: Where possible changes in grade should be handled by contouring the land. Retaining walls when necessary shall keep to the minimum height required.
2. The Block

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

Guideline: Maintain the pattern of primary building entrances facing the street. Renovations should preserve the original building entrances facing the street.

3. Landscaping:

Guideline: Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.

Guideline: Maintain a clear separation between sidewalk and street and between sidewalk and site. Harvard Belmont Landmark District Guidelines

Guideline: Keep the space between sidewalk and street as a green planting space maintaining the same width wherever possible. Ground covers may be used in place of grass. Do not use crushed rock, concrete or similar materials as the major surface material.

Guideline: Privacy of existing properties should be preserved

4. Fences and Walls:

Guideline: If fencing is required, low fences are encouraged especially in front yards to maintain the existing openness of the district.

Guideline: Fencing and wall materials shall be consistent with the district.

Guideline: Planting is encouraged to soften the visual appearance of fencing and walls.

Secretary of the Interior Standards

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

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/HW/TC

7:0:0

Motion carried.

022124.6

BOARD BUSINESS