

The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649 Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 228/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting Seattle Municipal Tower 700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor Room 4060 Wednesday, April 15, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker Robert Ketcherside Aaron Luoma Sarah Shadid Matthew Sneddon Mike Stanley Elaine Wine

Staff

Erin Doherty Rebecca Frestedt Melinda Bloom

Absent

Nick Carter Alison Walker Brems, Chair Jeffrey Murdock, Vice-Chair

Elaine Wine, Acting Chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

041515.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 1, 2015 Deferred.

041515.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

041515.21 Columbia City Landmark District

5000 Rainier Ave. S. – Royal Room

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Proposed sidewalk cafe

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a sidewalk café, with seating for 6 tables and 12 chairs. Exhibits included plans and photographs. She reported that on April 7, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application and recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Tia Matthies explained that they would incorporate ornamental gates into the rail to keep in line with what others in the neighborhood have done; one side will be 3' and the other 4'. She said that they will use natural wood slab for tabletops; they will be cut down to size, sanded and finished with marine varethane, similar in appearance to the wood detail on the façade. She said the rail will be black wrought iron and she provided details on the proposed chairs. Responding to questions she showed what the wrought iron rail will look like; she said the rail will be free standing, bolted to ground and will not attach to building; and then explained that their space will be code compliant.

Public Comment:

Pete Lamb, Columbia City property owner, said that this portion of the District has been a pedestrian dead zone and the sidewalk café will help enhance pedestrian friendliness in that area.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said it is good for activation and meets code.

Mr. Sneddon said he had no objection.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for street use for a sidewalk café located at 5000 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed street use meets the following sections of the <u>District ordinance</u> 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 #10

MM/SC/AL/DB 7:0:0 Motion carried.

041515.22 Columbia City Landmark District

4739 Rainier Ave. S. – Igimo Art Station

Proposed signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of signs, consisting of one 30" h x 135" w wall sign; door and window signage; and replacement of the sign face on a freestanding sign. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. Ms. Frestedt reported that on April 7, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application and recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Sally Brucker provided context of the building and site. She said they will remove the existing sign and replace it. She said there are three colors: chocolate brown, teal and white. She said the business is an art studio. She said that vinyl decals and logo will go on door and sign will be on the north side. She said the freestanding sign will be a two-sided non-illuminated sign on the sign frame.

Ms. Frestedt explained that the sign base and frame were stolen and will be replaced in-kind.

Responding to a question from the Board, Ms. Frestedt said that the Board previously approved new exterior paint colors, but the building has not yet been painted. She distributed the approved colors.

Mr. Berger said the main part is a lighter color but the trim matches her proposed chocolate.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Luoma said the vinyl is larger than what would be approved on historic building but it is okay because of the building and where located; it is relatively see-through.

Ms. Wine said there is transparency.

Ms. Frestedt said the remainder of the building is modestly signed.

Ms. Wine said the new closely matches the proposed paint scheme.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs located at 4739 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

The proposed signs meet the following sections of the <u>District ordinance and</u> the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:

Guidelines/Specific

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 regulations in Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 23.55 (Signs) and the following guidelines shall apply to signs in the District. The provisions of these guidelines apply to at least the following: (1) any sign located out-of-doors; (2) indoor signs located within three feet of a window and visible from the street, sidewalk or other public place; and (3) "place of business" identification signs.

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.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards #9 and #10

MM/SC/RK/SSH 7:0:0 Motion carried

041515.23 Columbia City Landmark District 3811 & 3815 S. Ferdinand St.

Proposed final design of a new 3-unit attached townhome development behind two contributing homes; proposed removal of exterior stairs on a secondary façade and site alterations.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed Final Design for new construction of an attached, three-unit townhome development to be sited behind two contributing homes. She said the proposal includes modifications to the stairwell on the secondary façade of 3811 S. Ferdinand St. Exhibits included plans, photographs, specifications and materials. She said that 3811 S. Ferdinand S. (Peirson Apartment Building) was constructed in 1908; 3815 S. Ferdinand S. (Peirson, Van R. and Agnes, House) was constructed in 1891.

Ms. Frestedt said that there have been three project briefings since January of 2014 and she noted the briefing summary included in the staff report. She reported that in March 2015 the CCRC received a briefing on revisions to the landscaping, mailbox location, colors and finishes. The Committee recommended softening and toning down the light color on the façade and modification or simplification of the trim and accent colors so as not to compete with the contributing homes. In August 2014, the CCRC received a briefing on the preferred massing option. Discussion included: recommendation to soften the alley façade with landscaping/planters; color options; Committee supported modern approach to differentiate townhomes from contributing properties; and expressed concern about the entry experience for residents of townhomes. In January 2014 the CCRC received a briefing on different massing and unit studies presented by the applicant. The Committee stated a preference for three vs. four units and recommend reducing the height and breaking up the massing.

On April 7, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application and recommended approval of the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

Kevin Broderick, Broderick Architecture, provided context of site and the existing homes and sightlines from the street. He said the new construction will be screened from Ferdinand by existing houses. He said they reduced the massing and added fenestration to mitigate the view from Rainier. He said there will be three units in three stories on a 370-390 square foot footprint, a three car garage; there will be pedestrian access through the site. He said they will remove a stair on existing house but will keep the decks. He said the proposal includes a new multi-unit mailbox and lighting fixtures to be installed between the homes. He said units are three stories and relatively compact. There is a deck on the third story to help break up massing. He went over the materials: CMU along alley at the ground floor, vertical cedar siding

and Hardi on the upper stories. He said the design will not compete with the contributing house, but will serve as a backdrop to the houses. He provided landscaping plans.

Pete Lamb, developer, said they wanted to make sure the new construction wasn't visible off of Ferdinand. He said it is set back 7 1/2' from the alley. He said that stairwells they propose to remove are non-original.

Ms. Wine cited the Staff Report and said that applicants were responsive to CCRC comments and concerns.

Mr. Luoma asked about the removal of the existing tree.

Mr. Lamb said it is a very old pear tree which the arborist recommended to take down.

Mr. Luoma asked who would maintain the potted vines and flowers on top of the trash enclosure.

Mr. Lamb said the landlord will.

Mr. Stanley asked if they considered setting back the east façade of the new construction to allow for additional windows.

Mr. Broderick said they did but that the footprint is so small.

Ms. Wine asked how the design fits into the neighborhood.

Mr. Broderick said they have allowed the contributing buildings to get the focus. He said they looked at different rooflines etc. and CCRC asked them to simplify the form and be more backdrop building.

Ms. Wine asked about windows.

Mr. Broderick said they are aluminum.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker noted that the changes made were good.

Ms. Shadid called it a thoughtful development.

Mr. Ketcherside said more housing is needed and he noted that the design doesn't compete or distract from contributing houses. He said removing

parking and non-used staircase is not the same as removing a large backyard that had been used. He said he'd feel different if that were the case. He said he would support the proposal.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Final Design of new townhomes to be located behind 3811 and 3815 S. Ferdinand St. Approval includes modifications to the rear stairwell at 3811 S. Ferdinand St. This action is based on the following:

The proposed final design and exterior alterations meet the following sections of the <u>District ordinance and the Columbia City Landmark District</u> Guidelines:

Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:

Guidelines/General

- 1. Scale should be compatible with existing development in the District.
- 2. The District should be pedestrian-oriented on the street level.
- 3. The self-contained, small-town quality of the District should be maintained.
- 4. A mixture of uses should be encouraged within the District, for example:
- a. Street-level uses: restaurants, retail, commercial, and public service offices.
- b. Upper-floors uses: restaurants, residential, professional offices, and commercial.
- 5. The inventory of contributing buildings, spaces, historic uses, historic views, and present uses should be respected and maintained.
- 6. New construction should be compatible with existing development in terms of scale, materials, and setback.
- 7. Reproduction or recreation of earlier buildings is not desired.
- 8. Emphasis should be given to maintaining the character of, and enhancing compatibility with, contributing buildings.

Guidelines/Specific

13. New Construction

- **A. Siting.** New construction shall be compatible with historic buildings in terms of the setback, orientation, spacing, and distance from adjacent buildings.
- **B. Setback.** Because commercial street facades are uniformly located at the front property lines, there is a strong street edge definition in the District. Continuous street walls with little or no ground-level setbacks are the historical precedent.
- ii. Residential (Including multi-family)
- a. Orientation
- 1. Primary facades and main entrances shall front on the street. Garages located on primary elevations are discouraged.

- 2. Residential buildings adjacent to public open space, including Columbia Park and the Columbia Library grounds, should front on the public open spaces and relate to the open space through the use of entryways, porches, and permeable landscaping. Fences are discouraged.
- b. Setback. Residential buildings should maintain setbacks set by adjacent buildings and historic precedent.
- **b. Massing/Scale.** Massing, or physical bulk and size, of all new buildings in the District must be consistent with the massing of existing historic buildings. ii. Residential
- A. Height/Width. New construction that exceeds the height and width of adjacent buildings should be designed to be compatible by breaking up the mass of the building to conform to widths of residential historic buildings in the District.
- **c. Form.** The form, or overall shape, of new construction should relate to neighboring historic buildings and promote a visual sense of continuity. Unusual building and roof forms are discouraged.
- ii. Residential
- A. Roof Form. Design and maintain rooflines to reflect traditional roof configurations and pitches found on historic residential buildings in the District.
- **d. Facade Composition.** Use a solid-to-void ratio, or window-to-wall ratio, that is similar to that which is found on historic buildings within the block and throughout the District. Façade design must provide visual interest (depth and relief) and avoid large unbroken surface areas.
- ii. Residential
- A. Windows and Doors
- 1. The relationship of width to height of windows and doors and their placement on the façade should reflect the same relationship found on other residential historic buildings within the District.
- 2. Window and door casing and trim should be designed with depth and visual relief.
- **e. Materials, Colors and Finishes.** Materials commonly used on historic buildings in the District are preferred. Colors should be subdued and consistent with the historic buildings within the District.
- ii. Residential
- A. Building facades should be clad in stucco, brick, or wood clapboard, shiplap or shingle siding, or a combination thereof. Synthetic materials and faux wood graining are discouraged.
- B. Wood and metal-clad windows are preferred. Vinyl windows are discouraged.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards #2, #9 and #10

MM/SC/RK/SSH 6:1:0 Motion carried. Ms. Wine opposed.

041515.3 DESIGNATIONS

041515.31 <u>Seattle Times Building Complex – Printing Plant</u> 1120 John Street

Evan Lewis, owner representative, said they did not support designation.

Rich Hill, McCullough Hill Leary, said the building is not appropriate for designation. He said the designated Office building is one of the most wonderful buildings in Seattle, the printing plant is not.

Larry Johnson, The Johnson Partnership, provided context of the neighborhood and described the buildings on the parcel. He said the 1950s addition is the most prominent. He showed the addition line on the east façade and noted it stepped back a little. He said the upper cornice detail was replicated from the 1930 building. He said all the windows are non-original and have a different configuration. He said the west and south facades are not visible. He said the exterior is different; the original office building is sheathed in limestone and crafted spandrels, and the printing building is castin-place concrete. He said the interior is non-original but noted sawtooth skylights in one area. He said the original office building is linked to the printing plan by a skybridge. He said that the original light well between the original office and plant buildings has been changed. He said there is no integrity and called the building a 'concrete shell' that isn't intact enough.

Mr. Johnson said that the building did not meet the standards for designation and noted the significant associations were with the original office building and not the printing plant.

Ms. Barker asked if the sawtooth skylights are visible.

Mr. Johnson said only from the roof.

Mr. Luoma asked if the entry in the light well was altered.

Mr. Johnson said it was altered in the 1960s; now it is all commercial storefront.

Public Comment:

John Pearson, Mirabella resident, spoke against designation and stated it did not meet criteria D or F which he thought were the only pertinent criteria. He

read from a letter provided by Louise Miller (in DON file) who also did not support designation.

Patricia Tinnel, Mirabella resident, said she did not support designation.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma spoke to the printing plant's association with the Times and said it meets criterion C. He said it is not just a building but a function of printing a newspaper. He said the cultural connection is difficult to ignore - the paper was a significant aspect of the City and this plant served that function. He said there are some integrity issues, but he supported criteria B, and D as well but less so. He said that the plant was less connected with the Blethens because of when it was built. He said the architecture is utilitarian and warehouse scale; the pedestrian experience is not great and the architect did that intentionally. He said the building design is subtle, and something the board might have approved themselves, as an addition to the designated office building. He noted they may have had budget issues to address. He said he supported criterion E as well.

Ms. Barker said that the east façade is the only thing that speaks about relevance and tells a story of the need for space and growth. She said there is no integrity to the building but that the east façade is sympathetic and complementary; she supported designation of the east façade on criterion C.

Mr. Stanley said he can see the arguments for criterion C for the east side only. He said he liked how the plant progressed over time, but only barely. He said that it was an economical way to continue progress. He was undecided.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria B and C and noted the Blethen family legacy. He said one shouldn't get hung up on 'beauty' because a building doesn't have to be beautiful to be significant. He said the Times was one of two major city newspapers, and had a major influence on culture and politics. He asked "what is a newspaper without a printing plant"? He noted the expansion of the building to address the growth in readership – the printing of pages and the way the structure supported that with access and materials to understand the way the newspaper operated. He said it is minimalist, the massing is clean and the windows could be replaced.

Mr. Ketcherside said criterion C is the strongest. He said that integrity on Thomas Street is not good and it cannot convey its significance. He said that on Fairview the building continues the aesthetic of the office and is obviously related to it. He said that producing a newspaper involves gathering, writing, printing, producing; he said the east façade tells the expansion story and the extension of the corporation. He supported designation.

Ms. Shadid said the building is not compelling but that she supported criterion C. She noted the strong relationship to the original building and the importance of printing.

Ms. Wine said the building and architecture are an appropriate response for a production facility – it is simple and elegant. She did not support designation because the building can't convey what it did and she noted the loss of integrity with the window replacement.

Mr. Stanley said the building was reviewed twenty years ago, and if they did not include it in the designation then, he didn't want to contradict that decision.

Ms. Doherty said that there is no clear documentation of what other portions of the building were considered when the 1930 office building was designated.

Mr. Sneddon said we have no idea what that other board saw – the history might have been written differently.

Ms. Doherty said that after five years there is an opportunity to reconsider and evaluate a property. She noted that the Board should consider the information that is currently being presented by the applicant.

Mr. Hill said the report for the 1930 office building described the printing plant but did not include in the controls.

Ms. Doherty read the areas of control from the Ordinance for the 1930 office building.

Karen Gordon said that when the Controls were negotiated for the office building, the Seattle Times expansion plans were considered. She said they no longer write specific controls for future development, because sometimes they're not built.

Ms. Doherty clarified that Staff Recommendation is for the exterior of the building.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Seattle Times Building Complex – Printing Plant at 1120 John Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/DB/AL 6:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Wine opposed.

041515.32 <u>Seattle Times Building Complex – 1947 Office Building Addition</u> 1120 John Street

Larry Johnson prepared and presented the report (full report in DON file). He provided an overview of the building. He said the addition of the west most bay is barely a discernible change, although it altered the original symmetry of the building. He said that nothing original remains inside – the balcony doesn't line up with the windows and the floors don't align – only the façade unites the buildings. He said that the chimney stack in his slide is no longer visible. He read from the original designation report which emphasized the building's symmetry.

He said the building doesn't meet any of the criteria for designation. He said that while the building imitates the style of the original it does not embody the Deco/Moderne style. He said that symmetry is an important aspect of Art Deco and the addition destroyed that. He said the Admiral Theater and Harborview building are better examples of the style. He showed several images of other symmetrical Art Deco buildings. He said there is a disconnect at the interior. He said that the building is not an outstanding example of William Fey's work and said the mass and symmetry were destroyed. He said the mid-block addition is not real visible.

Mr. Luoma said he thinks the Seattle Tower is actually asymmetrical.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Shadid supported designation and said the argument regarding lack of symmetry didn't make sense – she noted the asymmetrical addition at the recently designated McGilvra Elementary School. She said this meets criteria C and D.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on criteria C and D. He said the addition is masterful, and copying the original was not easy. He said the continued expansion tells an interesting story.

Mr. Sneddon didn't agree with the arguments regarding symmetry and style mimicry. He said that it would not be unusual to mimic the original style with an addition made in the 1940s, as opposed to the 1950s or 1960s where the addition would have been more of a statement about the change in architecture. He supported criteria C and D. He said the building is part of the history of the growth and development of the Times complex as a whole,

and it is interesting to follow the history. He said they modernized the Art Deco motif and extended the style.

Mr. Luoma said the symmetry is important in Art Deco design, but does not think the addition here detracts from the building. He supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. He said the building served a vital function. He said the architect recognized this as the main façade and chose to copy what was there. He said it was a good decision at that time.

Ms. Barker supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. She said the addition is carefully designed and is balanced by the printing plant, so the deviation from symmetry doesn't bother her. She said that the addition is so true to the original which is outstanding.

Mr. Stanley supported designation on criteria C, and possibly D and E. He noted the care with which the addition was done and said he is not bothered by the asymmetry issue.

Ms. Wine said the addition clearly has integrity and the ability to convey its significance; she said it is a faithful recreation of the original. She supported criteria C and D.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Seattle Times Building Complex – 1947 Office Building Addition at 1120 John Street as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C and D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/SSH/AL 7:0:0 Motion carried.

041515.4 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator