



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 482/07

MINUTES

**Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, November 14, 2007– 3:30 p.m.**

Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen
Mollie Tremaine
Alyce Conti
Mark Hannum
Tom Veith
Christine Howard
Ron Martinson
Stephen Lee

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Beth Chave
Rebecca Frestedt
Joanne Walby

Absent:

Henry Matthews
Czarina Nicholas
John Schwartz

Stephen Lee, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

111407.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 17, 2007

Mr. Veith noted a word correction for page 12.

ACTION:

To approve the minutes from October 17, 2007 as corrected.

MM/SC/CH/RM 5:0:2

Minutes adopted. Messrs. Hannum and Martinson abstained.

111407.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

111407.21 4860 Rainier Ave. S.
(Columbia City Landmark District)\
Lotus Yoga

Alyce Conti arrived at 3:45pm.

Application: Ms. Frestedt presented the application on behalf of the business owner, Maia Laverty. She reported that the applicant proposes to install a custom-designed business identification sign on the face of the building to the right of the first floor entrance. The sign will be constructed of steel, featuring the name of the studio and two round decorative dials. The dials will be connected by an adjustable stainless steel rod (1/8" thick, 10 gauge). The Lotus Yoga logo and website address will be applied to the steel dials using metallic dark brown vinyl. The top portion of the sign will consist of PVC lettering (1/2" deep) adhered to the steel backing.

Dimensions and attachment: The top portion of the sign is 28" w x 7" h. The top disc is 15" in diameter. The bottom disc is 7" in diameter. The sign extends 3' 3" from top to bottom. It will be attached to brackets mounted on the wall and aligned with the mortar. A white neon sign with a clear acrylic backing (45" w x 12" h) is proposed for the second story bay window.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt reported that the CCRC/LPB reviewed and approved an application for alternate signage in October 2005 but the approved signage was never installed. The Grayson & Brown Building does not have a tenant signage plan. On November 5, 2007, the Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed signage. She said the Committee appreciated the custom-design of the signage and thought that the neon is consistent with another recently approved neon sign.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if additional businesses may locate on the second floor in the future.

Ms. Frestedt stated that she wasn't aware of any plans additional businesses on the second story.

Ms. Sodt noted that the business owner also has an office in the building.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion: Mr. Abelsen commented that the application meets the guidelines. Other Board members agreed.

Action:

“I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed exterior alterations. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

Relevant Code citations

SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

Relevant guidelines 11. Signs, a. Window Signs and Hanging Signs, e. Upper Floor Signs, h. Neon Signs.”

MM/SC/MH/CH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

111407.22

Satterlee House

4866 Beach Dr. SW

Application: Preliminary Design for proposed new construction of three houses

Applicant Comment: Richard Hill, representative for the owner, said the current owner bought the property in order to build six cottage homes, pursuant to the model cottage home ordinance, which has since expired. He said the owner now proposes three homes on three lots. He said he submitted a declaration by Mr. Satterlee to staff which he believes, indicated Mr. Satterlee’s understanding that there would not be any restrictions on development of the front yard. He agreed that the landmark ordinance does include the site, but noted the owner and the City have different interpretations, which he said is irrelevant today. He said they submitted today’s application under protest.

Mr. Hill said that the Board needs to consider SMC 25.12.580 which states that the Landmark’s Board actions should not prevent a property owner from getting a “reasonable rate of return”. He said the ARC was very helpful with their advice that suggested that the lawn should not be developed and the size of the homes be reduced. He said they can’t reduce the size of the homes because it would prevent the owner from receiving a reasonable rate of return. He said the proposed development retains the open lawn and the view corridor and the Satterlee Home is not adversely affected. He said the Satterlee House with garage is 2155 sq. feet while two of the three homes are smaller than this at 1940 and 2080 sq. feet, respectively. He said to rent this property for a year would bring in only \$24,000, which he said is not a reasonable rate of return. He said in order to have a 2% rate of return from the time the property was purchase, it is necessary to have homes built to this size. He requested that the Board approve the Certificate of Approval.

Ms. Chave said the applicant had presented the current proposal on March 2, June 15, July 27 and September 14, 2007. She said the ARC has not made a recommendation to the full Board on this project. She said the property owner has applied for and received approval from DPD for subdividing the westerly lot to allow for three houses, noting this action requires obtaining a Certificate of Approval for the construction of houses on the lots. She said the Board's decision must be based on whether the design of the proposed houses meets the factors of SMC 25.12.750 and the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*; the Board does not determine whether the proposed lots are buildable.

Susan Busch, project architect with Baylis Architects, said the Satterlee House is located on a 16,000 sq. ft. lot, and is 200' from Beach Drive. She said the westerly lot has been divided into two parcels and zoning code will allow a height to 30' and 35% lot coverage. She said the proposed new homes will be accessible by two driveways. She said she designed these three urban townhouses driven by three sets of criteria: 1) the owner's requirements, 2) SMC Code related to "Character defining features, and 3) the Historic Seattle easement from May 2000 which requires that the view corridor not be less than 40'. She said she believes the proposed houses compliment the Satterlee House and frame the view corridor to the Satterlee House. The garages will be tucked out of view. She said the style is modernist and very different from Satterlee's classic Seattle Box design. She said the materials list has not yet been determined but will probably include "Northwest Contemporary" materials. She presented photographs of the view and said the homes will be lower than Satterlee and the first house will be out of view from the pedestrian angle when the Satterlee house comes into view.

Regarding the landscape plan, Ms. Busch said there would be no change to the lawn and the existing landscape around the house will be enhanced to provide a better frame view of the home.

Ms. Chave noted that a letter from Mr. Hill, received this afternoon, was distributed to the Board at this meeting. She said if the Board needs more time to consider this it could defer a decision on this application.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum asked if the new lots would be under the Landmark Board's review.

Ms. Chave said yes, since the entire site is landmarked. She said the view corridor is part of the easement agreement with Historic Seattle, not a City of Seattle landmarks requirement.

Mr. Abelsen asked Ms. Busch what other elements, besides size and style, are being presented as part of the application.

Ms. Busch said they are requesting approval for the floorplan, elevation drawings, building character, massing, scale, height, footprint, site plan, access arrangement to site and the relationship to street.

Mr. Abelsen asked whether “Northwest Contemporary” description referred to cladding materials or design.

Ms. Busch said Northwest Contemporary refers to the cladding materials.

Mr. Abelsen asked if they considered lowering the houses by half a story, to reduce the height.

Ms. Busch said they did not, believing that there are grading and ground issues on the site that she cannot comment on but she said because of the topography, the houses would be lower than the Satterlee House.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen noted that the proposed location appears to provide a view corridor, but his biggest concern is the scale of the proposed houses relative to the landmarked building. He said he was concerned that the scale and view from the south shows the middle house as quite large. He said the styling of the houses should respect the Satterlee House more.

Mr. Veith remarked that the letter submitted today to the Board cites economic reasons for not taking the ARC’s advice at the previous meeting, and no alternative plans have been presented. He said he feels strongly that the applicants have not examined all of the alternatives. He suggested the Board defer consideration of this application until they have time to review the letter and the economic argument that Mr. Hill is making.

Ms. Conti said in order to evaluate the economic argument made in the letter they would need more information on the housing market in West Seattle.

Mr. Veith added that he thinks the full Board should be briefed by members of the ARC on their previously stated concerns on this application.

It was the consensus of the Board that this application should be deferred until the next meeting.

Action:

The Board moved to defer consideration of a Certificate of Approval for Preliminary Design for the proposed construction of three houses.

MM/SC/MT/MH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Mr. Hannum requested documentation from the applicant related to the economic argument.

Ms. Conti asked for documentation on the gross rent collected from the Satterlee House.

Mr. Veith recalled that at the previous ARC meeting, one or two ARC members may have felt that there was no development that would meet requirements of ordinances and two or three other ARC members stated that there was some development that might meet the requirements of the ordinance. He recalled these ARC members making the following suggestions: the new buildings should be subservient to the landmark building, maintain the idea that it was one site and not four; the new houses should be possibly smaller and as far north as possible on the site; any part of that structures that could be moved between buildings(garages) should be moved there so the houses aren't pushed forward; detailing should be less busy, the buildings should be simpler and they should be lower and a suggestion was made about how this could be accomplished by building (part) into the site. He said the main concern was that the site is part of the landmark and the proposed buildings as they are proposed now do not respect the landmark site.

111407.3 NOMINATIONS

111407.31 Standard Oil Buildings
3301 Densmore Avenue N.

Staff Report: Staff does not recommend the nomination of the Standard Oil Buildings at 3301 Densmore Avenue North as this property does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

Applicant Comment: Rich Hill said a developer has an agreement to purchase it and redevelop the site. The City Historic Preservation staff recommended that the owner self-nominate the properties.

Mr. Veith stated that he is member of Wallingford Community Council which has discussed future plans with the owner, and part of group that appeared before the King Co. Council opposed to sale of the property to the current owners. He said he has no financial interest in this case but offered to recuse himself if the applicant requested.

Ms. Judith Riley, representing the owner King County, said that would be appropriate.

Mr. Veith agreed to recuse himself.

Mr. Veith recused himself.

Applicant Comment:

Jeannie Chresla and Jennifer Flatman architectural historians with Entrix Corporation presented the nomination report.

Ms. Cresla said the building is located north of Gasworks Park and between Densmore and Woodlawn Avenue. This Moderne style, concrete-poured building was constructed in 1927 by Standard Oil engineers. The parcel includes the main building, 11 storage tanks, an L-shaped building and a pump house. The main room of the building held a classroom, workshop and garage. The original doors and windows remain. The eleven storage tanks were removed and this area turned into a parking lot. The south building consists of warehouse space and offices. The pump house was demolished by the County. She said the main building's garage doors have been replaced with entry doors, the skylights were enclosed and some windows on the west elevation were covered with plywood. She said the windows may exist behind the plywood). The east elevation still has the concrete globes at the gable ends of the building and the diamond crest at the center. The windows on this elevation have also been filled in.

Ms. Cresla said the south building retains its L-shaped plan and was originally a barrel storage area. The doors and windows have been in-filled, the sloping car port, the ramp and stairs were all added by King County. Some of the west elevation openings have also been closed. On the east elevation, windows and doors were changed out and stairways added. The interior spaces have been changed to office spaces with dropped ceilings and fluorescent lights. Some of the buildings retain original truss works and skylights, but the majority of the interiors have contemporary finishes. She showed photos of the north building that retains the valves that led to the tanks. She said this building has seen numerous alterations, including interior remodels in 1970 and 1990s.

Ms. Flatman gave historic context for the site. She said this area was platted in 1883 and when the railroad came through in 1887 there were canneries and sawmills in this area before it was annexed by the City in 1891. A gas plant was constructed in 1907 at present-day Gas Works Park to meet the growing needs for heat and lighting for the City. Throughout WWI there were ship-building manufacturing facilities in this area. Standard Oil built this plant in 1927. The Standard Oil trust was created in 1870 and by eventually controlled 90% of oil products in the United States. In 1911 Standard Oil was broken up into 24 smaller companies by the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. Standard Oil of California's first plant was built in Seattle in 1888 and had several other buildings by the time this subject property was built in 1927.

Ms. Cresla provided a comparative analysis of other Standard oil plants including the Salmon Bay Facility which is still in operation with two of the original warehouse buildings, Pt. Wells District plant (built 1920), Shell Oil Distribution Plan on Harbor Island (1930) and Texaco Distribution Plan on Harbor Island (1940).

Ms. Flatman said the integrity has been compromised by the removal of the significant features and character-defining features: 11 oil tanks, pumphouse, garage doors and windows and the interior alterations. Regarding the landmark criteria, she said this building is not associated with Standard Oil because it was built after it was broken up and along with many other oil companies contributed to the economic development of Seattle, but was only one of many such buildings. She said it did not meet any of the other criteria.

Judy Riley, of King County, said she does not believe it meets the threshold criteria because it lacks architectural significance and has lost several significant features, specifically, the 11 oil tanks.

Ms. Chave referred the Board to several public comment letters.

Board Questions:

Mr. Martinson asked what is the current coating on the exterior walls.

Ms. Cresla said it has a light stucco finish.

Ms. Tremaine asked the thickness of the walls and was told approximately 12”.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Martinson said the building does retain some integrity and he could support the nomination under criterion F.

Ms. Conti agreed with Mr. Martinson.

Ms. Howard said she did not support the nomination because she believes it does not convey its significance and lacks integrity.

The other Board members agreed that the loss of the tanks compromised its integrity and it did not adequately convey its significance and they did not support the nomination.

Action:

“I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Standard Oil Buildings at 3301 Densmore Ave N as a Seattle Landmark, as this property does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350.”

MM/SC/MH/CH 6:1:1 Mr. Martinson opposed. Mr. Veith abstained.

111407.32 Maple Leaf Reservoir
8526 Roosevelt Way NE

Staff Report: Staff does not recommend the nomination of the Maple Leaf Reservoir at 8526 Roosevelt Way NE based on the designation standards of SMC 25.12. (see staff report)

Applicant Comment: Stephanie Murphy, program manager for Seattle Public Utilities’ reservoir program introduced Susan Boyle and Matt Hammill of BOLA Architecture. She said that they will present the nomination information

Ms. Murphy said the City plans to bury seven reservoirs throughout the City so they can meet Federal and State drinking water regulations. She said they had originally wanted to cover them with floating covers but after 9/11 they decided to bury them with reinforced concrete and covered by 2’ of soil and grass.

Susan Boyle said the site is complex and includes 4.5 acres of Park Department property. The reservoir features a gravity fed water service and a steep embankment that separates it from the Park Department field and gatehouse. The portion of the site to be nominated includes a “flag lot” including an extended leg down almost to 82nd Street and the gatehouse, an elevated steel tank (built 1948-49), a radio communications building near the base of the tank, a chlorinating tank (1950s) at the bottom of the south berm and a sodium-hydrochloride structure, built in 1994. The fence as extended down to the property edges and does not coincide with the nominated property. She said the Park Department Property’s field house is not included in the nomination, nor is the pumphouse.

Ms. Boyle reviewed the history of water provision in Seattle, which was provided by private companies starting in 1850 until the Great Fire when the City decided to create its own Water Department. The Maple Leaf Reservoir site was selected in 1905. The gate house is a 470’ sq.ft structure made of brick and terra cotta with a pumphouse in the basement. The parapet edge was replaced in the 70s. The reservoir can be seen from the northeast and northwest public right of ways. The view from the tank is mainly territorial.

She said the maple leaf stencils on the tank are not historic. She said the steps on the southern berm are date from 1910.

Ms. Boyle reviewed the condition of the gate house: the doors are new and openings on the east side have been infilled. The masonry shows evidence of water damage from the roofline and spalling of the terra cotta.

Regarding the landmark criteria, Ms. Boyle said the reservoir's association with the expansion of the Water Department makes it significant but does not meet the double significance required in criteria C. Although the gate house could meet criterion D, she said there have been many changes, including the windows and doors and the brick has degraded. Further, the elevated tank retains its historic features, but is not unique and she doesn't believe it meets the landmark criteria. The reservoir could meet criterion F, because of the scale of the site and its contrast with the surrounding neighborhood, but she said this is not a dramatic contrast and the water in the reservoir is not visible from the neighborhood.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith noted that he was told by a Maple Leaf business owner that Maple Leaf reservoir is at the highest point in the City.

Ms. Boyle said it is actually the third highest point in the City.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the same designer planned the gate house and the L-shaped building.

Mr. Hammil said yes.

Mr. Abelsen asked if the development of Seattle's water treatment process has any significance related to technological advances.

Ms. Murphy said they changed from using gas chloride to sodium hypochlorite for safety reasons a few years ago, but the structures themselves were not affected by this.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Conti said she was undecided, but that it may meet criterion F.

Mr. Martinson said he thought it met criterion F, especially the elevated water tank.

Mr. Abelsen agreed because the tank is identified with the neighborhood.

Larry Johnson, architectural historian, said the Seneca and Galland buildings are a composite of three buildings built between the late 1890s and 1914. The building had been renovated in 1985 by LMN Architects and the storefronts and glazing were replaced.

Mr. Justen explained that Samis Land Co. purchased these buildings in 1969 and in 1986 entered into a ground lease with Wright Rundstad & Co. because of their plans to build the Washington Mutual Tower. The buildings had been boarded up except for some retail.

Mr. Johnson pointed out the parapet and stone base features and said the back elevation has been re-glazed. The cornice was damaged during Nisqually earthquake. He said that real estate developer, Amos Brown, had his home on this site at the end of the nineteenth century and it was one of the last houses in downtown. The Seneca Building has an association with the development of the central business district and housed the Stone, Fisher and Lane Department store, which moved from this location in 1906. The residence, the first location of Holy Names Academy, was previously on this site at Second Avenue and Seneca. He said this is an example of late 19th century commercial masonry load bearing structure, but he cited the Pioneer Building and Cadillac Hotel and others as examples of better such structures. He said the architect was Edwin W. Houghton, who also designed the Olympic Block, the Grand Opera House, Arcade Building and the Moore Theatre and Hotel. Houghton was best known for his theater work.

He said the Seneca Building is somewhat prominent because of its corner location on Second Avenue. He noted that this was a category two building in the Downtown Building Survey and although it may meet criterion D, he did not think it had enough integrity after the 1985 renovation to convey its significance.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the 1985 renovated storefront and the window replacement were modeled on the original design.

Mr. Johnson said this was correct, noting that the rear facade glazing on the Seneca street elevation has been replaced with double glazing, but the Second Street glazing retains its original configuration and perhaps original sash on upper windows.

Mr. Abelsen asked why Mr. Johnson thought the scale of the building was so small and if this has any significance related to the development of the area.

Mr. Johnson stated that it was built shortly after the fire and only with three floors, including the basement. The investor who built it probably only needed a small building and this one started as a department store.

Mr. Hannum asked why the egg-and-dart decorative feature changes scale.

Mr. Johnson said Houghton designed the first section but the later addition was probably built using different stone and brick work.

Mr. Justen noted that in his experience he has found many historic buildings had darker brick on the upper floors, perhaps because it was added before the lower level bricks were cleaned.

Mr. Veith asked why the pilasters are not the same size.

Mr. Johnson said the buildings don't share a common wall so a column was added when the second building was built.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith said he would support the nomination under criterion D because this building is an interesting essay on the masonry detailing of its time despite the changes to the glazing.

Ms. Howard said she was undecided, but leaning towards nomination under criterion D.

Mr. Hannum said the building is interesting but felt it didn't meet the criteria.

Mss. Tremaine and Conti and Mr. Abelsen agreed.

Mr. Martinson said he felt it met the threshold criterion and would support nomination under criterion D and maybe F.

Mr. Lee said he felt it was not significant enough to warrant landmark status.

Action:

I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Seneca Building at 1201-1209 Second Avenue for consideration as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/MT/VA 6:2:0 Messrs. Veith and Martinson opposed.

111407.34 Galland Building
1211-1215 2nd Avenue

Staff Report: Staff does not recommend the nomination of the Galland Building at 1211-1215 Second Avenues as it does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

Applicant Comment: Mr. Justen said they initiated this nomination before the Downtown Survey was released. It is a 108' x 120' building on two lots. He said it was recently renovated and is the first platinum LEED in Washington State.

Mr. Johnson said the eastern facade window configuration is original but has been reglazed with double panes. The storefronts have been modified and the interiors remodeled including the wood structural columns covered and made round with plaster. The cartouches on exterior remain. This building was named for Caroline Kline Galland (the only building downtown to be named for a woman). Although Ms. Galland was philanthropist, she has no association with this building beyond the name. He said this was not a strong enough association to warrant Landmark status. Regarding criterion E, the architect was Max Umbrecht also known for Globe building and Caroline Kline Galland Residence. The building is prominently located on a corner, but has no contrast in scale and doesn't stand out. Mr. Johnson noted that while this is a category two building in the Downtown Building Survey, it was not determined eligible for the National Register during a past Section 106 review.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith noted that the remodeled penthouse was given an AIA honor award.

Mr. Johnson said he was not aware of this.

Mr. Hannum asked if the pergola in the sketch presented to the Board was ever built.

Mr. Johnson said no, but the sketch must have inspired the penthouse that eventually was built.

Mr. Abelsen asked Mr. Johnson to elaborate on Mrs. Galland's history.

Mr. Johnson said she married a rich man and helped the poor Jewish community in Seattle. He said the Galland home is in Seward Park and the Galland endowment is still in place; Mrs. Galland passed away after the building was built as an income generator.

Ms. Tremaine noted that there is a Galland house on Madison Street.

Public Comment:

Christine Palmer, Preservation Advocate for Historic Seattle, said this building may meet criterion B because of its association with Mrs. Galland, but because the building is extremely altered, it may not meet the threshold criteria. She said it should be valued as being one of the last of a group of department stores located on Second Avenue.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Veith remarked that it had been significantly altered but the basic form remains. He noted that when the Board considers landmarking schools, they don't consider the person for whom a school is named as having an association significant enough to warrant landmarking the building.

Other Board members agreed that although it had an interesting namesake, it had been too significantly altered to warrant landmark designation.

Action:

I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Galland Building at 1211-1215 Second Avenue as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/VA/CH 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator