



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 65/09

### MINUTES

**Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting**  
**Seattle Municipal Tower**  
**700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40th Floor**  
**Room 4060**  
**Wednesday, January 21, 2009 – 3:30 p.m.**

#### Board Members Present

Stephen Lee  
Marie Strong  
Alyce Conti  
Tom Veith  
Christine Howard  
Mark Hannum  
Mollie Tremaine  
Sean Peterfreund  
Stephen Lee  
Henry Matthews  
Vernon Abelsen

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Alyce Conti

Chair Stephen Lee called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

### **012109.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES** Meeting of December 3, 2008

#### Action:

To approve the minutes of December 3, 2008 as amended.

MM/SC/MH/MS Mr. Lee abstained.

**012109.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

012109.21 Victorian Row  
1234-1238 King St.  
Proposed exterior storm windows

Ms. Chave explained the application for storm windows and introduced Kij Kelly, Historic Seattle, who would present the application. She noted it was a straightforward application that had been reviewed by the ARC.

Applicant Comment:

Kij Kelly explained the intent of the project to design, fabricate and install wood storm windows on all 84 windows on all elevations of the building. The windows will be single pane, undivided light, with the awning being top-hinged. They will be painted to match the historic existing double hung sash color that is on the building now. The storm window will not protrude beyond the existing trim that surrounds each individual window. Once installed, the storm windows will greatly improve the energy efficiency of each of the low income rental units. They plan to have the work completed by late spring of this year.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen stated ARC had no problem with the application and that it was a good approach to energy efficiency, with minimal impact to the historic character of the building.

Ms. Strong clarified that the hardware on the bottom would be on the inside.

Mr. Kelly concurred.

Mr. Veith said the detailed drawings show the window in a schematic fashion but it is clear what is being done and it is a minimal change to the existing fabric of the building. He said it is in line with the usual criteria for review and meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior storm windows, as per the submittal. This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed change does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance #108224 as the installation of the proposed exterior storm windows 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*.

The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/MT/VA

9:0:0 Motion carried.

012109.22 1073 Summit Ave. E  
(Harvard-Belmont District)

Proposed renovation, including window repair/replacement and roofing replacement

Renee Roman, Leavengood Architects, explained the proposed work, and said some changes to the 1890 house occurred in 1920 including some to fenestration. She said there was an absentee owner for years and the house was in bad shape. She said the gable still exists and it will be replaced in-kind. She said they will match in kind (as close as possible) the windows and trim and will put in new landscaping. She said there are no significant trees or vegetation. She said the original roof is under the asphalt; they propose to re-roof with a sustainable rubber roofing material that intends to replicate a wood roof. She said they also want to install a rainwater harvesting system which can't be done with a wood shingle roof.

Mr. Lee interjected that that the proposed rubber roof would be an appropriate solution.

Ms. Roman explained the landscaping would have a Victorian sense to it with a focus on edibles and natives; the final plan was not yet available.

Ms. Chave cited the HB Guidelines section that states to "maintain existing landscaping especially the mature trees; maintain the alignment and spacing of street trees; maintain a clear separation between sidewalk and street; etc."

Ms. Roman stated there are no street trees because there isn't much of a planting strip; in the 18" planting strip they will put in a ground cover.

Mr. Veith asked why the number of windows is reduced on the north side.

Ms. Roman explained that there is a lot of window variety on the north side. They will be reducing the window variety; some fenestration will be removed. They will use what is there now as the style. If anything is missing they will replicate what was done in the 1920s and 1930s. The set back is non-conforming and they want to see a reduction in glazing there. They propose to change locations of a couple windows while switching windows out.

Mr. Abelsen noted that while the entire building is shown in the elevation drawing to be demolished, they really mean just the cladding and trim.

Ms. Roman confirmed.

Mr. Veith stated the original windows which looked to be originally double hung and are now shown as casement.

Ms. Roman concurred and stated it was for screening purposes.

Ms. Tremaine asked if the shingles being removed are original. Ms. Roman noted they were from the 1920s – 1930s and for structural stability the building needs to re-sheathed. She said there were no photos of what the building originally looked like.

Mr. Lee noted the dramatic change on the west elevation and noted it is not the primary elevation.

Ms. Chave added that the west elevation is not under Board jurisdiction (not visible from the public way)

Ms. Roman explained the door is undersized at 5'6"; they will use a more traditional height. The opening will remain the same 2'8" door.

Mr. Abelsen said the Board has not seen proposals for "skinning" a building as what is being proposed. Even though the siding was replaced in the 1920s and windows may have been replaced, the proposed removal of siding and replace with new material is significant.

Ms. Roman stated they are replacing in-kind: wood shingle with a new wood shingle that matches the same exposure. It will have the same ribbon coursing on the first floor and it will have a 5 ½ exposure on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor as it is now. Trim features will be removed and documented and then replicated and put back up. It will be painted. The building will look more like it did in the 1920s and 1930s.

Mr. Abelsen stated their approach to documenting the process of removal is appropriate for the whole process.

Mr. Matthews noted the building was very dilapidated – the windows and shingles need replacing. He said as a member of the Harvard-Belmont Committee, he was at the site meeting where this project was reviewed but the HB Committee. He thought the proposal was a good solution

Public Comment:

Ms. Chave said several emails were received in support of the project. Those e mails were included in the Board packets.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee thought it a remarkable project and well worth doing.

Mr. Veith stated that although the building itself is not a landmark it is in a landmark district. In terms of what is visible from the street the house is returning to it original appearance. The roof, siding, landscaping, and windows are all appropriate.

Mr. Hannum didn't want to see original fabric destroyed but in this case it is necessary.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior renovation, including window repair/replacement, siding replacement and roofing replacement, and proposed landscaping, as per the applicant's submittal. The Board approves this proposal with the condition that the applicants completely document the existing condition of the siding and trim to ensure that the replacement of siding and trim elements are in-kind; and conditional upon submittal of the final landscaping plan. This action is based on the following:

2. The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Harvard-Belmont District Development and Design Review Guidelines:

**C. 1. Additions or renovations:**

Guideline: The exterior materials used for additions shall be similar to exterior materials used in the original building and should be finished in ways that are consistent with the original building.”

Guideline: Preserve the visual quality of individual facades including use of materials, form and structure.

Guideline: The exterior materials used for additions shall be similar to exterior materials used on the original building and should be finished in ways that are consistent with the original building.

The proposal also meets the following Standard of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

Standard # 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

012109.23

Terminal Sales Annex

1931 Second Avenue

Proposed preliminary design and partial demolition

Marty Goodman explained the intent to build a high-rise hotel and condos on five lots. The landmark building on the interior lot will be the focus. He said they have worked closely with ARC; DPD is prepared to issue the MUP.

Ms. Chave explained the Certificate of Approval is for preliminary design, review of massing only.

Dan Foltz went through images via Power Point and provided context for the site.

Mr. Goodman explained two buildings on the south end would be demolished; the most southern building was constructed in 1919, is a Category 3 building which didn't qualify for Landmark status because of deterioration and lack of integrity. The other building is a Category 4 building which didn't qualify for Landmark status because of much alteration.

Mr. Foltz pointed out flagpoles that had been removed at some point will be replaced. They will be preserving materials and primary features of the building; they will preserve the historic character and relationship to the site; and they will protect the historic significance making visible differences between old and new. The new development is subordinate to the historic structure. The façade of the historic structure will continue further back into the new building.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith stated the applicants were responsive to ARC commentary.

Mr. Hannum asked the applicant to explain the setback.

Mr. Foltz explained the new building will be set back 13 ½' from the old and the historic façade wraps around. The historic ground floor space will become the lobby for the hotel.

Ms. Howard asked if alternatives were considered for the corner.

Mr. Lee complimented the applicant and said they provided many options; the corner was very well explored. The applicant showed many iterations.

Ms. Tremaine said the Annex had to be the most important thing on the street.

Mr. Abelsen noted the tower is dominant but the applicant's focus on the street level and first few floors help to give greater emphasis to the façade of the Annex

Mr. Veith explained the façade was designed to be seen while the sides which are blank walls were not meant to be.

Public Comment: there was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Matthews was happy with the final results; the tower has been set back.

Ms. Howard appreciated the base and that it would provide a similar street experience for pedestrians.

Mr. Veith can't wait to see it at night and thought it will look pretty cool.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Preliminary Design for the new addition and partial demolition as described in the application submittal and submitted plans, conditional upon Board review and approval of all construction drawings, finishes and details necessary for a final 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, a substantial portion of the first bay is proposed to remain, therefore the primary elevation 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 retaining more of the south wall, as well as additional set back of the tower on the roof--the design has evolved to incorporate ARC feedback. The ARC has asked for and has been provided with the rationale for the siting of the tower on the parcels included in the development site.
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/MH/MS

9:0:0 Motion carried.

**012109.3      CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

012109.31      Dr. Annie Russell House  
5721 8<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

Action: I move to approve the signed Controls and Incentives agreement as presented.

MM/SC/VA/CH                      9:0:0    Motion carried.

012109.32      Wilsonian Apartments  
4700-4720 University Way NE

Action: I move to approve an extension of one month.

MM/SC/TV/CH                      9:0:0    Motion carried.

012109.33      Sorrento Hotel  
900 Madison St  
Request for extension

Action: I moved to approve an extension of two months.

MM/SC/MT/MH                      9:0:0    Motion carried.

012109.34      Terry Avenue Building  
320 Terry Ave N  
Request for extension

Action: I move to approve an extension of two months.

MM/SC/TV/MS                      9:0:0    Motion carried.

012109.35      Securities Building  
1907 Third Avenue  
Request for extension

Action: I move to approve an extension of two months.

MM/SC/MH/MS                      9:0:0    Motion carried.

012109.36      Seattle Labor Temple  
2800 First Avenue  
Request for extension

Action: I move to approve an extension of three months.

MM/SC/TV/VA 9:0:0 Motion carried.

**012109.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Chave introduced Genna Nashem, Pioneer Square Board Coordinator, who will be assisting with downtown landmark applications while Sarah Sodt is on maternity leave. She explained two Board appointees were in attendance: Steve Savage and Meredith Wirsching; both are awaiting City Council confirmation.

**012109.5 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator