



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 511/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, August 19, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Robert Ketcherside
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair
Alison Walker Brems, Chair
Elaine Wine

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley

Chair Alison Walker Brems called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

081915.1 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

081915.11 Satterlee House
4866 Beach Drive SW
Proposed exterior paint colors

David Delafield explained the proposal to prep, sand, strip, and repaint the house and noted they preferred Color Option 1: Lewisburg Green base,

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

Philadelphia Cream trim, Yorktown Green belly band trim, and Stratton Blue accents.

Ms. Doherty said that ARC reviewed all three options.

Mr. Murdock said Option 1 is a reasonable color scheme. He asked about the muntins and tracery.

Mr. Delafield said they will do a test section to make sure it looks correct.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said that Historic Seattle has an easement on the house and she is thrilled with the new owners and is happy about the restoration. She supported the proposed color scheme Option 1.

Mr. Luoma asked about painting the gazebo.

Mr. Delafield said that the underside will be the house body color and the accents will be same as the house. He said it has a black pearl roof.

Ms. Doherty said just the exterior of the house is controlled, but asked the applicant to show the Board the gazebo and garage so that they would be aware it will all be painted to be compatible. She said she reviewed the new roof shingles administratively.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior paint colors, at the Satterlee House, 4866 Beach Drive SW.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed painting does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 111022 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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/NC 7:0:0 Motion carried.

081915.12 Securities Building
1907 Third Avenue
Proposed signage

Lyn Krizanich, Clise Properties, explained that the 3rd and Stewart long term tenant is rebranding; Sleep Country will become Sleep Train. She explained that the channel letters will be illuminated and noted they will attach to an existing aluminum raceway which contains electrical conduit. She said the letters are no larger than what is there now including the background. She said they will reduce the length of the raceway to be more consistent with the shorter signs being proposed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior signage, at the Securities Building, 1907 Third Avenue.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123204 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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/NC/AL 7:0:0 Motion carried.

081915.2 TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

081915.21 Paramount Theater
901 Pine Street

Ms. Sodt reported that the owners have been good stewards of the building. She explained the Transfer of Development Rights program. She said the Board is requested to verify the eligibility of the Seattle Paramount Theater at 901 Pine Street for the transfer of development rights (TDR); the Board is also requested to approve the required covenant. The code provisions require:

- Designation of the building(s) as a City of Seattle Landmark, pursuant to SMC 25.12;
- Execution of a Controls and Incentive Agreement regarding the Landmark and recording of same against the property;
- Receipt of a TDR authorization letter from DPD, which establishes the amount of TDRs available for transfer from the sending site;

- Provisions of security to assure completion of any required rehabilitation and restoration of the landmark, unless such work has been completed.
- The owner must also execute and record an agreement in the form and content acceptable to the Landmarks Preservation Board providing for the maintenance of the historically significant features of the building, per SMC 23.49.014D(4). The owner has completed, and the City Historic Preservation Officer has approved, subject to final approval by the Board, a covenant that includes the commitment of the owner to maintain the Paramount Theater consistent with Ordinance No. 117507.
- In this case the provisions of SMC 23.49.011 also apply, and therefore DPD is also a signatory on the covenant to ensure the performing arts theater use established under approved permits, including combined seating capacity in one or more venues for at least 800, for at least 40 years from the first use of any Landmark TDR

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine said it is great.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board makes the determination that the Paramount Theater at 901 Pine Street has fulfilled the requirements for transfer of Landmark TDR pursuant to SMC 23.49.014 and Ordinance No. 120443 – that the building is a designated Landmark with a Controls and Incentives Agreement pursuant to Ordinance No. 117507; that an authorization letter from DPD has been received and has identified the number of transferable square feet to be 136,144 square feet; and, the building is not presently in need of rehabilitation, therefore no security is required.

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

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approved the agreement entitled “COVENANTS FOR LANDMARK TRANSFERABLE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS” as submitted to the Board as the legal agreement required as a condition to the transfer of development rights from the Paramount Theater at 901 Pine Street, per SMC 23.49.014D(4).

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

081915.3 NOMINATION

081915.31 Singerman House / Gaslight Inn

1727 15th Avenue

Nomination report in DON file.

Susan Boyle, BOLA, introduced the nomination and said the Foursquare house is beautiful and intact. She noted its several layers of history. She noted its association with the development early on of the top of Capitol Hill; she said the area was one of high end residences. She noted the city trolley system. She noted the area's landmarks: Fire Station #7, Christian Science Church, and Capitol Hill Methodist Church.

Megan Scott, BOLA, reported that the house was built in 1904-05 for Paul Singerman who owned the first department store (more than one room) in Seattle. She said the store was at Front and Columbia and although it was brick it burned in the Great Fire. She said that a year later he reopened the store and replenished the goods. She said the next year the store was sold to McDougal Southwick. Singerman and Sons was in business until 1914. Singerman died in 1950. She noted the Singerman son married into the Friedlander family. She said in 1907 the house was sold as apartment buildings were starting to go up in the area. She said that Nathan Eckstein and his wife owned the home for a while. James Christensen purchased it in 1927 and subdivided it into ten SROs.

Ms. Boyle said that there are no original records or drawings for the house. She said when the dense urban fabric of Seattle started to breakdown – there was movement out of the City. She noted redlining, but said that the Jewish communities persisted. She said that the area became more blighted but there was still urbanity; there were good families and schools. She said that the area was lower income which was good for artists and creatives. She noted the non-majority demographic and the gay and lesbian community. She noted beautiful buildings were purchased and restored and had different visions for them.

Owner Stephen Bennett said he purchased the house from Dwight Christianson (son of the previous owner) - who was then 102 - and his two daughters-in-law. He said it was the early 1980s and many of the community's men were dying of AIDS; he and his late partner, Charles Trevor Logan, wanted to give back to the community. He said they held many memorial services in the house and housed the visiting families as well - that is how their Bed and Breakfast had its start. He said they did fundraisers for Norm Rice and Patty Murray; Barney Frank stayed there, and Mayor Ed Murray used the house for a reception.

Ms. Boyle said that civil rights – marriage – very analogous to immigration – everything changes. Layers. Redevelopment of that period.

John Fox said he always knew the house was special; it belongs on 14th Ave. E. but was built where it was. He noted the expansive use of quarter sawn white oak at the interior. He said that fir was used on the second floor.

Mr. Bennett explained the approach to rehabbing the Foursquare House – the cubic mass, hipped roof; the primary façade is intact with leaded windows and stained glass windows. He noted the detailed roof outriggers, brackets below the windows, and chimney. He said the former driveway on the north side was landscaped. He said they opened up the attic space. He said the guest rooms are not original. He noted the original gas and electric lights on the newel posts.

Ms. Boyle said the house would not meet criteria A or B but could meet C for the association with early Jewish community and the revival of the area toward the end of last century. She said the house would meet Criterion D. She said that it would not meet Criterion E – they don't know who the architect was – nor would it meet Criterion F.

Regarding Criterion F Mr. Fox commented that the house is prominent in its neighborhood.

Ms. Wine asked where Singerman moved to.

Ms. Scott said he moved to another location on Capitol Hill – built another house.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if Ms. Scott checked MOHAI for connections between the Singerman and Friedlander families.

Ms. Scott said she did not, but will follow up.

Public Comment:

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, thanked the owner for bringing the nomination to the board. She said the house stands out and it is nice to know the layers of history and noted the significance of the building's recent past. She supported nomination.

Jennifer Mortenson, Washington Trust for Historic preservation, echoed Ms. Woo's comments and noted she was pleased to see the self-nomination. She supported criteria C and D and suggested inclusion of some interior spaces.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination. He said to consider Singerman constructing the house – he lived there and it was the embodiment of his

future; or, as a businessman building new homes every couple years. He said the house meets Criterion C and noted that the story of the early 1980s is emotional and personal to the neighborhood community, City, and on a nationwide level. He said the report was fantastic and captures why the house should be nominated. He said the owner's story is captured in the process.

Mr. Carter supported nomination on criteria C and D and noted he didn't think there was enough for B. He said Singerman was a business man and the house was a money-making investment. He said the cultural history of the last 32 years is equally as important as the previous 80 – 100 years. He said the owners did a great job rehabilitating it.

Mr. Murdock supported nomination on criteria C and D. He noted the architectural quality and said the house exhibits characteristics of the style. He said the owners have exhibited 35 years of good stewardship. He said the cultural significance is importance and thought some of the interiors should be included.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination on criteria C and D and commented that the owners have been good stewards. He said that he has not seen too many nominations under Criterion C for the recent past. He said the majority of the community knows it as the Gaslight Inn and its significance of the more recent past. He said its current ongoing history makes it unique among many; Singerman himself is not as strong as the Gaslight history but credit will be given to Singerman in the records and in the name of the property.

Ms. Wine supported nomination on criteria C and D and said the house distinguishes itself especially as a Foursquare. She noted the beautiful detailing. She noted the recent cultural history and said that there aren't many residential buildings that would fall within criterion C.

Ms. Barker supported nomination on C and D. She said she was happy the owners self-nominated and was reminded of the designated Judge Ronald House. She said that house had been a rooming house and noted the sad photos. She said that the current owner cared enough to restore it. She asked for more information on Singerman and Christensen. She supported inclusion of the recommended interiors.

Ms. Walker Brems thanked the owners. She said it is not common to see a house in rough condition and to decide to take it on and bring it back to life. She said it is a wonderful thing.

Mr. Bennett said he is so lucky to have lived there for 35 years – the house has a great soul. He said that Susan Boyle is 'better than mashed potatoes'.

Ms. Walker Brems asked for a tour for the board.

Ms. Barker suggested inclusion of Criterion B.

Mr. Ketcherside suggested discussing the interiors not in the Staff Report.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Gaslight Inn / Singerman House at 1727 15th Avenue for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the site; the exterior of the house; and the following areas of the first floor interior: entry hall, main stair, living room, dining room, library, and parlor (former ballroom); that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for October 7, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

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

081915.4 BRIEFING

081915.41 Terminal Sales Annex
1931 Second Avenue
Briefing on proposed building alterations and new construction

Jack McCullough reported that the MUP should be issued next month.

Dave Heater and Steve Jones from Ankrom Moisan provided an overview of design to date and noted that at the June presentation board members provided feedback. The focus of this briefing was on the non-primary façade condition as well as review of massing development. Presentation packet in DON file. Following are Board questions and comments.

Mr. McCullough said that a 40-story building was permitted in 2007. In design meetings former board members the east façade was the focus. He said the approach at that time was to give the east façade more presence. He said they re-massed the building and removed some density. He noted the intent to allow the Terminal Sales building - the better back façade of the two - behind to shine. He said structural engineer Guy Conversano reported that the unreinforced structure of hollow clay tile would be difficult to hold up on the west façade. He said preservation of the east façade – the largest freestanding façade – will be reinforced with steel and piles.

Ms. Barker asked what was meant by ‘high for independent bracing’.

Mr. McCullough said that it is tall and would take more heroic efforts to maintain. He said that it is too tall and brittle; he said they could do anything if they had the money.

Ms. Barker said she was surprised at their characterization that it was difficult.

Ms. Wine asked if the east façade bracing would be visible.

Mr. McCullough said that temporary bracing would be used – steel bracing on the west and south sides during construction – and then removed when the façade is tied into the new building. He said they are keeping the existing concrete beams.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine said she appreciated the revised detail around the historic building and said this is her preference – to engage the historic structure with clean façade on the sides. She noted the urban context and said it is friendly to its neighbors. She said the volume as a whole and how it relates to the adjacent buildings is successful. She said she was torn with allowing just the façade as opposed to the whole building. She said it is hard in retrospect – they already have the design. She said that most historic buildings have structural issues and she was not compelled by the DCI report. She said the overall aesthetic is pleasing but she preferred preservation of the whole building and not pieces.

Ms. Barker said she appreciated the slimmer tower. She said that with regard to façadism their comments make sense but that maybe we don't want the largest freestanding façade.

Mr. Murdock said he wants to see more development of D2; it preserves the scale and development of heights on 2nd along with some development on the corner. He said he is bothered by lowering the floor level of the landmark. He said it is an amazing opportunity to engage the sidewalk and it will be odd to have people so low with no visual connection between sidewalk and interior. He said he is happy with the way they turn the corner on Virginia – it is pleasant, open and engaging. He said he is not happy with the way the tower crosses the landmark building and said it will just read as a façade projecting out of new building.

Ms. Walker Brems said it is hard to compare the preferred option with options D1 and D2 because they are not as developed as the preferred option. She said she was feeling supportive but has issues with dropping the level of the floor within historic structure and that hasn't changed; it is a missed opportunity to engage the sidewalk. She said it is façadism with at least the echo of historic massing. She liked the slimmer tower and its setbacks from the landmark. She commented on the floor level in the landmark and how they are treating the hotel units – she questioned if they will feel like they are in a historic

building. She said that it may be an opportunity to do something on the interior – maybe an interior treatment that makes the public more interested to go in.

Mr. Ketcherside said it reminds him of taking the Denny Hill grade and painting on the side of the building. He said that the starting point should be the complete preservation of the building. He said without the preservation lens it is an attractive project and this is better than the A option. He said that they are saying that the introduction of the annex building so close to the Terminal Sales building was a mistake. He noted the urban fabric with no air moving through the city. He said he would like to save the building completely.

Mr. Carter agreed and said number one is to save the building. He said he likes they managed to save chunks of the north wall. He said it is façadism but at least they have some return so can see the form. He said he was not worried about losing the alley façade. He said he likes what they have done but that he would defer to the board architects.

Mr. Murdock said the building was planned for adjacency. He suggested allowing a two story side on Virginia to remain. He wanted to know more about windows on the landmark – if they are historic and what they plan to do.

Mr. Luoma said there is enough room on the north and south to allow development. He said when he tries to picture what it may look like he pictures two long skinny towers looming over. He said the proposal is more an integration of the building. He said it is hard to know what development would look like if it were to not touch the landmark building – the board hasn't seen an exploration of options that don't touch the landmark at all. He said there is enough space at 2nd and Virginia. He said it would be nice to have people at grade level on the interior first floor and not looking out at knees and ankles.

Mr. Murdock asked why the hotel lobby is at the top.

The applicant representative said it is the owner's desire. He said there is a small space at the ground level and they will add more program there.

Ms. Barker asked if they looked at a taller skinny tower and remove portion of tower to north of landmark. She said that big signage and wall of Terminal Sales Annex are emblematic of the building.

They are proposing to build over the landmark but developed portions of north wall would be exposed – blank as it is today.

Mr. Murdock noted the challenge of a mid-block building with blank façade. He said the building is just an east façade. He said it was intended as infill. He said that D2 is not a fair representation.

Ms. Walker Brems said to keep the massing and celebrate the historic building through occupancy. She noted the Parsonage – a landmark building that has been more comprehensively celebrated and used in the development.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the elevator to the top with expansive view of city and said to continue to make it something of a core component of the building. He said to make sure that people are aware when they are in the historic building.

The applicant representative said that all suites will be in the historic building.

Ms. Barker said to show elevation at north end of internal aisle.

Mr. Murdock asked them to come back with response to board comments.

081915.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator