



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 329/16

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, June 1, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Marjorie Anderson
Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Kathleen Durham
Robert Ketcherside
Jordon Kiel, Vice Chair
Kristen Johnson
Jeffrey Murdock
Julianne Patterson
Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Aaron Luoma, Chair

Vice Chair Jordan Kiel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

060116.1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 6, 2016

MM/SC/DB/RK

10:0:0 Minutes approved.

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

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

April 20, 2016
MM/SC/DB/NC

8:0:2 Minutes approved. Messrs. Ketcherside and Murdock abstained.

060116.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

060116.21 Columbia City Landmark District
4825 Rainier Ave. S.

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed relocation of the existing 2-sided freestanding sign and post. Exhibits included photographs, renderings and samples. The Bank of America is a non-contributing building located within the Columbia City National Register District. The existing sign was approved by the Board in 1999. On May 11, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

Steve Zamberlin, National Signs, explained they are relocating signs to accommodate new construction to the north. New location will provide better visibility due to the construction of the Angeline apartment building, adjacent to the bank.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said it was straightforward.

Mr. Ketcherside said it was necessary.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for relocation of a sign, located at 4825 Rainier Ave. S, as proposed.

This action is based on the following:

The proposed work meets the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

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 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.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards

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

MM/SC/NC/JM 10:0:0 Motion carried.

The following item was reviewed out of agenda order.

060116.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

060116.41 Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Seattle Branch
1015 Second Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the request for an extension.

Mr. Ketcherside asked about a statue that is now at the site.

Ms. Sodt said she will make an inquiry and noted that it was placed on the building. She said she is OK with the request for extension to October 5. She said that ARC will be seeing a revised design packet.

Mr. Sneddon arrived at 3:38 pm.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, Seattle Branch, 1015 Second Avenue, until October 5, 2016.

MM/SC/DB/JM 10:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Sneddon abstained.

060116.23 Northwest Rooms
305 Harrison Street
Proposed exterior tenant signage

Ms. Doherty indicated that the application included two components, one was a proposed revision to a previous approval, and the second was a retroactive approval of window film, as indicated in the Staff Report.

Russell Blazier, SkB Architects, explained the existing field of donor tiles, and the proposed expansion is 16”W x 58”H. He noted increased donor support and additional tiles will be placed per illustration. He said they will be 6” clear of World’s Fair plaque. He explained they have applied opaque film to some windows on the courtyard to block light that’s getting into the performance space. He said they have about 400 events per year.

Responding to a board request Ms. Doherty provided a detailed drawing of the previously approved donor tile layout.

Ms. Barker asked if there was still room on the west façade for more tiles.

Mr. Blazier said there are no plans for more; they are finishing their capital campaign.

Ms. Barker said the tiles are 6” away from historic plaque when there is room on the west façade.

Mr. Blazier said there is a planter there and no room for more tiles. He said what they are proposing is a more practical location.

Ms. Barker said she wished there was more information on the historic plaque which is getting overrun by donor tiles.

Mr. Kiel said the relation of the historic plaque to the handrail is not great either.

Mr. Murdock said that ARC reviewed and said the legibility of foundation wall is important, and any more tiles beyond this proposal would be frowned upon in the future. He said it is a serene courtyard and the repetition of structure is important to experiencing the building. He said they should have come to the board before installing the black-out film, but said that he would not vote against it.

Mr. Sneddon agreed with Mr. Murdock. He commented on the longevity of the film material and said they should come to the board for approval before making any changes to these windows in the future.

Ms. Johnson said it is removable and not a permanent intervention; she said she wants prior review before future installations.

Ms. Barker said she was sold a false bill of goods with previous KEXP proposals and did not support this application. She said there are so many other things that could have been done to block out the light – this is distracting. She preferred seeing roller shades or something similar that is lowered and raised as needed.

Ms. Johnson said that ARC the applicant explained the other options they looked at and ruled out as ineffective.

Mr. Stanley said it is temporary.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior signage at the Northwest Room &

International Fountain Pavilion, 305 Harrison Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 124584 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale 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/JP 9:2:0 Motion carried. Ms. Barker and Mr. Ketcherside opposed.

060116.22

Columbia City Landmark District
4850 Rainier Ave. S. – Toby Building
Proposed business signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed installation of a 2' x 2' illuminated cabinet sign to be hung within the storefront window and the addition of window vinyl signage on the door and north- and west-facing windows (12" high sign bands).

Exhibits included photographs, renderings and samples. The Toby Building was constructed in 1892 and is a contributing building located within the Columbia City National Register District. The Landmarks Preservation Board last approved for signage by this tenant in 2011. On May 11, 2016 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee was supportive of the vinyl decal signage and the placement and design of the hanging sign. Committee members discussed the sign lighting guidelines and noted that the proposed sign is located on the storefront interior, rather than on the exterior of the building. Committee members expressed concern about the sign's lighting temperature (6,500k) and supported approval of the application, conditional upon the lighting temperature being reduced to 2,700-3,000k.

Jeffrey Taylor explained he contacted the signage manufacturer, Everbrite, who told him reducing lighting temperature/bulb would void the warranty. Responding to questions he explained that State Farm has a variety of signage to choose from; he chose this style because it works well in the window and it is tastefully placed. He said all State Farm offices had to change signage.

Mr. Ketcherside said ARC recommended he talk to the sign manufacturer about how this has been handled nationally.

Ms. Patterson asked how the sign compared to adjacent businesses including Geraldine's and Island Soul.

Ms. Frestedt said there is a slight variation but all are within the same range. She said the Committee wanted a warmer light.

Mr. Taylor said the illumination is only at night – during the day you can't tell it is on. He said it is not a large sign and it doesn't jump out as being out of place.

Mr. Stanley and Mmes. Patterson and Johnson said they were OK with it.

Mr. Ketcherside said his only concern was that the local review Committee asked for warmer lighting. Ms. Barker concurred.

Ms. Sodt said the board can direct the applicant to work with Ms. Frestedt.

Ms. Frestedt said that other components of the application were considered and Mr. Taylor was responsive.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs, located at 4850 Rainier Ave. S, and/or explore other alternatives as approved by Staff.

This action is based on the following:

The proposed signs meet the following sections of the District ordinance, the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards:

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 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.
- g. **Sign Lighting.** Sign lighting should be subdued and incandescent. Back-lit signs are prohibited. Signs that flash, blink, vary in intensity, revolve or are otherwise in motion or appear to be in motion shall not be permitted.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards

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

MM/SC/DB/RK 11:0:0 Motion carried.

060116.24 Holyoke Building
107 Spring Street
Proposed business signage
Deferred.

060116.3 DESIGNATION

060116.31 Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store
400 Westlake Avenue

Larry Johnson, The Johnson Partnership, provided context of the building and the neighborhood. He said the west and south are the primary facades. He said the southwest corner was enclosed in the 1950s. He said the original design the south and west had open bays. He showed the closing of bays over time and noted the corner was used as a gas station. In 1949 the sales room was moved to the southwest corner. He said there is only one original street level back on the west – all others have been changed. He said that four upper floor windows have been filled in and painted over.

Mr. Johnson said the building did not meet criteria A and B and only casually met C with its association with the development of South Lake Union. He went over the development of the neighborhood noting that in 1885 it was all small scale residential – homes, apartments, churches. He said in 1894 the Cascade School which was the last building from that time was torn down. He said from 1917 – 1927 the laundry industry was big. He said in 1930 the area was regraded and it became a more commercial type area. He said that by 1940 most auto dealerships were downtown but the best example of auto row was Capital Hill Pike-Pine. He said that most auto activities in this neighborhood were at the south end of South Lake Union. He said that there were a lot of service oriented buildings in the 1950s. He said that it does not meet double significance threshold. He said that the building is not representative of the Firestone style because there wasn't a Firestone style – he provided photo examples of other Firestone buildings from around the world. He said this building had no connection to Liberian politics. He said the building did not meet Criterion D and provided photos of other local buildings that were more worthy. He said this is a pedestrian building; it is not exceptional and there are better examples of terracotta – that is not painted - in Seattle. He said the building was designed by the California office of the Austin Company and this is not an outstanding work. He said the building did not meet criteria E or F.

Jack McCullough said the building does not have integrity – it is a simple building and its relation to the street is its key feature. He said that seven of eight bays have been changed and the relation to the street has changed. He said that auto uses are scattered throughout the City and there was no node in this area. He said that there is no Firestone typology – there is wide variation. He said this is one of the lease

designed Firestone buildings and there is no double significance to meet C. He said that the building did not meet Criterion D and noted there are finer examples of terracotta in the City than a belt course and 35 terracotta pilasters. He said the building is a simple concrete box. He said it is not a good example of Austin Company work – there are better examples elsewhere. He said that the building does not meet Criterion F and he cited Tom Bartholomew letter about the history of Firestone who went to Liberia in 1926, bought one million acres and bankrupted Liberia. He noted political impacts of connections in Liberia to Firestone. He noted the Seattle Comprehensive Plan focus on Race and Social Justice and Civil Rights. He said that designation of this building would be enshrining Firestone and its ties to slavery and predation. He asked the board not to designate.

Ms. Barker asked about the original infill of the bays.

Mr. Johnson said it was with wood. He said that in the 1950s commercial aluminum storefronts were installed. Some smaller areas were filled in with brick. He said that in 1980 the corner storefront was replaced – new doors were put in.

Ms. Barker said that Firestone was a tire manufacturer and asked about auto service rising on the side.

Mr. Johnson said they did brakes and sold gasoline.

Ms. Barker asked if there were other tire manufacturers who had side service businesses or were they unique in this.

Mr. McCullough said there was Goodyear.

Mr. Johnson said there was Probst as well as Goodyear in 1929.

Mr. Murdock asked about the filled in windows and said some appear in the photos to be operable.

Mr. Johnson said they were originally divided light; all have been painted over and some glazing has been removed. He said that the frames are there. Responding to questions he said that Firestone did not have central distribution. He said that at one time they did tire retreading, brake refinishing, and some storage. He said the freight elevator is still there and accesses all floors.

Mr. Ketcherside asked if Austin Company did a lot of Firestone buildings.

Mr. Johnson said he didn't think so.

Mr. Ketcherside said he read an article about all local businesses would build the building but the contractor wasn't local. He asked about the concept of super service stations and noted the expansion of the Sears Roosevelt store in the 1950s.

Mr. Johnson said that some stations sold bikes.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Murdock said it is a unique typology and he noted the context of the utilitarian building with Art Deco ornament. He said it is a fine example. He supported Criterion C and said that it has retained a vital and active use for 86 years and has left its imprint on the cultural economic life of South Lake Union. He said it includes the local commercial heritage and it stands out – like a hub in the neighborhood. He supported Criterion D and noted it is a 1930 utilitarian building commensurate with auto use; it is simple and has not changed much especially seeing paint removed from the terracotta. He supported Criterion F and said the building has been there 86 years; it stood out before and does even more so now.

Mr. Ketcherside said he supported designation on criteria C and D and noted he could support F. He said that regarding auto row the building opened in 1930; construction began in 1929 before the Market crashed. It was the tail end of the 1920s auto growth that began in Pike Pine and spread down to South Lake Union. He said a 1929 public drive in and park market did not get built because of the Market crash. He noted the McHale super service station in 1922 at 8th and Union that sold Cyberline tires; by 1932 they had 15 stores. Both came from auto-oriented Los Angeles which explains this building type. He said it doesn't explain the second floor. He wondered if Austin Company was working with Firestone in Los Angeles. He said the super service station type was a growing trend with the building type from Los Angeles. He said the peak was in 1922 and Firestone was on the tail end. He said that Sears opened in 1929 on 1st Avenue and provided service and tires. He said 1928-29 the Sears Roosevelt store opened and provided auto service there. He said that in 1940 the focus was on tires and gas was eliminated.

Ms. Durham said it is a simpler building and that she supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. She said it has housed the same business since construction and she noted the longevity of use as a tire store. She said she liked the utilitarian 1930 Art Deco and there are not a lot of iconic examples of the type. She said the terracotta is there and the language of the open bay is readable.

Ms. Barker said infill of the bays is an issue but the building is distinctive, was part of auto row, prominent on the site, and has been there a long time. She said the terracotta is floating. She supported designation on C and F and maybe D.

Ms. Anderson supported designation on criteria D and F. She said she struggled with the double significance of C but said the building is significant in the area. She said there is a tendency to blame / look down on because of the inhabitants or owners. She said it is an interesting building visually. She said it is utilitarian and noted the bays, deco addition. She said that she wouldn't vote against designation if C was included.

Ms. Patterson supported designation on C, D, and F and that she echoed other comments on D and F. She said that regarding C the building is significantly associated with the development of auto row area in South Lake Union and is one of the few that remains that conveys what the neighborhood used to be. She said it has high level of integrity and the use of the building is still apparent even though it has adapted over time. She noted the significance of its association with auto row and the regrade in the area.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on C, D, and F. He said it has 85 years of continuous use. He noted the auto culture and how it shaped the urban fabric and noted from 1910-40 the garages, service stations and dealerships. He said there are not as many markers left. He said the building conveys by location style and design and by utilitarian element the ‘all in one’ model. He said the failures are as telling as the successes and noted the gas pumps were removed. He said there are integrity issues but the windows can be fixed. He said there was massive growth nationwide 1915 – 1930. He said that this was architecture to sell tires. He spoke of reading a building and its history and part of the history of Firestone is the inclusion of the Liberia chapter. He said the built environment is an extremely powerful conveyor of history. He said that historic preservation is about history – the good, the bad and the in between. He said that for example internment camps are horrific but we can learn important lessons that that history can provide. He said the building needs help in telling that story. He said there is nothing like this building in the neighborhood and it meets criteria C, D, and F.

Mr. Stanley did not support designation. He said there is no double significance; there are integrity issues; the terracotta façade is not enough.

Mr. Carter supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He said he thought it was a landmark years ago – it was prominent then and it is even more so now.

Mr. Johnson did not support designation. She said she would love to see the terracotta cleaned and paint removed. She said it feels peripheral. She said if it were in its original state she might have supported it. She said she likes utilitarian buildings but this isn’t that special. She said that Criterion F gave her the most pause but that she would not support designation.

Mr. Kiel said it is peripherally associated with auto row. He said there is no Firestone typology. He did not support designation.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store at 400 Westlake Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/JM/DB 8:3:0 Motion carried. Messrs. Kiel, Stanley and Ms. Johnson opposed.

060116.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator