



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 483/15

MINUTES

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

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Robert Ketcherside
Aaron Luoma
Alison Walker Brems, Chair

Staff

Erin Doherty
Genna Nashem
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Elaine Wine
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair
Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley

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

Items were reviewed out of agenda order.

080515.1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
July 1, 2015
Deferred.

080515.3 **CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

080515.31 Pacific Science Center
200 2nd Avenue N.

Ms. Doherty reported that she had a signed agreement and went over areas of control.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to approve Controls & Incentives for Pacific Science Center, 200 2nd Avenue N.

MM/SC/NC/AL 5:0:0 Motion carried.

080515.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

080515.22 Harvard Belmont Landmark District
Women's Century Club/ Harvard Exit Theatre Building
807 E Roy

Proposed alterations including windows, trash enclosure, new entry door and stair, elevator penthouse and visible seismic bracing

Ms. Nashem explained the application for uncovering and repairing of windows, covering windows located at the elevator shaft but leaving the windows intact, new trash enclosure, new entry to the basement, seismic bracing visible in two windows and new elevator penthouse. The ARC/Harvard Belmont Committee Reviewed on July 30, 2015.

Applicant Comment:

Sarah Hatfield provided context of the site and neighborhood. She explained that the 1925 club was converted to a theater in 1969. She said they proposed to convert the building to mixed use, offices and restaurants. She said the windows are in good shape; they will maintain all and restore them.

She said that at the northwest corner a half flight exit stair to basement will be constructed. She said there will be nine risers down; the aluminum guard rail will be powder coated black. She said the walkway will be a simple paver in a natural color. She said that seismic brace frames will be hardly visible – she said they are applying for federal tax credits so chose the most satisfactory location. She said the 3” diameter pipe cross brace will be painted black.

She said that the trash enclosure will be constructed in the side yard. She said they will screen the dumpster with a 6’ high fence of black perforated metal; black powder coat. She said it will not connect to the structure; they will epoxy posts into the walkway. She said it will be 9’ back from the face of the building. She said that the new elevator will be set back in the side yard; the penthouse will extend 3’ above the parapet and be set back 15’ from the building face. She said that they will use new brick to make up the height. Windows in shaft will remain but be covered. She said the new brick is in keeping with National Park Services to show differentiation between new and old.

Ms. Walker Brems asked how the new brick will be capped.

Ms. Hatfield said that now the coping is metal cap flashing and they will treat the new brick similarly. She said they will use drip edge flashing and a row of half bricks to delineate. She said the top coping will match.

Mr. Carter asked if they will brace the parapets.

Ms. Hatfield said yes; she said that everything is internal and then will be tied to roof in three areas. She said the parapet will stay at typical height.

Mr. Luoma asked about impact to adjacent trees by new stair.

Ms. Hatfield said they looked at it and will have an arborist there. She said that it will be a potential bar or restaurant space. Responding to questions she said the alley doors led to the backstage area. She said there is another locked door on the sidewall which she thought was a loading area. She said they will use small containers/dumpster behind the screen.

Mr. Ketcherside asked how they arrived at the setback fence.

Ms. Hatfield said they set it at prescribed zoning measurements; they will use the side yard for bike parking as well. Responding to questions she said that they won't create undesirable alcoves that would encourage camping. She said that they will keep all additions in the same language.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said that ARC reviewed and noted the consistence of added materials and keeping the palette limited. She said ARC was generally favorable. She said there was no problem with internal bracing and the penthouse setback is ok.

Mr. Luoma said that the HB subcommittee toured the site and said the improvements are reasonable. He said that the brick on the overrun is only 3' high, setback; the cladding of brick is questionable but was recommended by the National Park Service. He said that perforated rounds is more modern but considering the setback and black metal it is reasonable.

Ms. Walker Brems said it is well thought out.

Mr. Ketcherside said he was pleased that much is being maintained. He said if the National Park Service recommends the brick he will defer to them.

Mr. Luoma said if the addition was larger he would disagree; he said that it is minor and clearly modern.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for uncovering and repairing windows, covering windows located at the elevator shaft but leaving the windows intact, new trash enclosure, new entry to the basement, seismic bracing visible in two windows and new elevator penthouse with brick cladding.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed restorations plans as presented August 5, 2015 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the buildings as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

2. CRITERIA AND VALUES

The category of the building shall be considered when changes are proposed. Category 1 buildings are the most important in the district and these properties shall, to the greatest extent possible, retain the intrinsic historic values recognized when the district was formed.

Building Categories

The buildings within the District are categorized as follows:

Category 1: Buildings and significant landscape elements with an identifiable architectural or historic significance in satisfaction of the appropriate criteria of the Seattle Landmark Ordinance (SMC 25.12)

These buildings characterize a distinctive architectural style, or contain elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which are characteristic of an architectural period. The preservation of these elements is of primary importance to the District. May also include historic sites.

C. INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS

1. Additions or renovations

Guideline: Additions should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is being preserved.

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 in the original building and should be finished in ways that are consistent with the original building.

Secretary of Interior Standards

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where

possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

080515.21

Harvard Belmont Landmark District

1137 Harvard Ave E

Demolition of chimney after the fact; and proposed rebuilding of existing chimney, and interior covering of two windows

Ms. Nashem explained the application for demolition of the chimney after the fact, proposed rebuilding of the existing chimney, and fill on the interior of two windows while keeping the windows on the exterior intact. She explained that at the July 15, 2015 meeting the board asked for more information.

Applicant Comment:

Carrie Anderson explained the existing chimney is in poor repair and they propose to rebuild it in kind using existing brick. She said they will seismically improve it and she noted details in the packet. She said that they will rebuild the chimney they removed to match original using matching brick. She provided elevations of chimneys. She said the windows on the north will be covered by cabinetry. She said that the elevation is screened by vegetation; they will cover the windows from the inside to retain them. She said the committee recommended painting the window gray to match the shade of the house rather than white and provided a paint sample of the gray.

Mr. Luoma said the local subcommittee toured the site and unanimously recommended a darker color behind the windows than white as earlier proposed as well as rebuilding the removed chimney. He noted the unfortunate removal of the chimney and said it is a large home where heating was required hence one would expect multiple chimneys. He said it also balances the house. He said the chimney was prominent.

Mr. Ketcherside asked for clarification on the chimney work.

Ms. Hatfield said that the south chimney is there now and will be rebuilt. She said the west chimney was the one they removed and the bricks were hauled away. She said they will rebuild the chimney with bricks that match what was there.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said she was glad to see the chimney returned.

Ms. Walker Brems agreed and said that painting the windows gray is good.

Mr. Luoma agreed and said this is a reminder to perform due diligence when considering work on a historic building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for rebuilding the demolished chimney, proposed rebuilding of the existing chimney, and fill on the interior of two windows while keeping the windows on the exterior intact.

The proposed exterior alterations meet the following sections of the District ordinance and The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines:

District ordinance

The proposed restorations plans as presented August 5, 2015 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the buildings as specified in SMC 25.22.

The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

2. CRITERIA AND VALUES

The category of the building shall be considered when changes are proposed. Category 1 buildings are the most important in the district and these properties shall, to the greatest extent possible, retain the intrinsic historic values recognized when the district was formed.

Building Categories

The buildings within the District are categorized as follows:

Category 1: Buildings and significant landscape elements with an identifiable architectural or historic significance in satisfaction of the appropriate criteria of the Seattle Landmark Ordinance (SMC 25.12)

These buildings characterize a distinctive architectural style, or contain elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which are characteristic of an architectural period. The preservation of these elements is of primary importance to the District. May also include historic sites.

C. INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS

1. Additions or renovations

Guideline: Additions should be sympathetic to the original design and should not, except as additions, change the character of the original structure which is being preserved.

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 in the original building and should be finished in ways that are consistent with the original building.

Secretary of Interior Standards

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
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/RK 5:0:0 Motion carried.

080515.23

Columbia City Landmark District
4864 Rainier Ave. S. – Lucky Rabbet
Proposed signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the request explained the request for a wooden blade sign for Lucky Rabbet to be attached to the existing Columbia City Gallery sign. Dimensions: 36”w x 28” h. Exhibits included renderings and photographs. The Columbia City Gallery (formerly the Columbia Department Store) was constructed in 1910 and is a contributing building within the National Register District. The existing sign was approved in 2007.

Ms. Frestedt stated that on July 7, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Staff presented the proposal on behalf of the applicant who was unable to attend the meeting. The Committee stated that they appreciated the unique design and said that the materials and colors are compatible with the District. CCRC members stated a preference for hardware that matched the color and finish of the existing stanchion. A CCRC member recommended exploring options that reduce the size of the rabbit or relocated the rabbit on the end of the sign to reduce the spacing between the signs. Members recommended approval of the application conditional upon exploration of spacing options between the two signs and modifying the hardware so it was a consistent color and finish as existing. The applicant revised the proposal in response to the Committee’s feedback.

Applicant Comment:

Hillary Gore, Lucky Rabbet Custom Framing, explained the bottom of the sign is 8’2” to the sidewalk. She said the spacing between the signs is intended to create some visual distance between to underscore that the business is separate from the gallery. She said the preferred option is consistent with her logo design.

Ms. Walker Brems asked if it will be wood and how it would weather.

Ms. Gore said it will be solid wood and sealed with resin.

Ms. Barker asked if it will hang into the vestibule.

Ms. Gore said it would, slightly. She said it is a 7' door in an 8 ½' vestibule. She confirmed that the sign will be double sided.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker said it is too bad the existing sign couldn't go higher.

Mr. Luoma said he wasn't too concerned because other signs in the district hang below vestibule as does the sign next door.

Mr. Carter noted there are others that hang low as well.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signage located at 4864 Rainier Ave. S. This action is based on the following:

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

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.

b. Blade Signs. Blade signs (double-faced projecting signs hanging perpendicular to the building), that are consistent in design with District goals are encouraged. Blade signs shall be installed in a manner that is in keeping with other approved blade signs in the District. They shall not hide, damage, or obscure the architectural elements of the building. The size should be appropriately scaled for the building.

Secretary of the Interiors Standards #9 and #10

MM/SC/DB/AL 5:0:0 Motion carried.

080515.24

Columbia City Landmark District
4906A Rainier Ave. S. (Weed Building) – Jus Bar
Request for retroactive approval of sidewalk café and signage

Ms. Frestedt explained the request for retroactive approval of a sidewalk café, consisting of three tables, six chairs (both black metal) and two planters. A brushed aluminum tube-frame railing surrounds the seating and is the applicant’s preferred finish. The applicant also requests approval for additional vinyl decal window signs (green and white band across window and door sign), as shown in the attached photos. Exhibits included plans and photographs. She said the Weed Building was constructed in 1909 and is a contributing building within the National Register District. Jus Bar received a Certificate of Approval for the wall and other window decal signs (excluding the band sign) in 2012.

Ms. Frestedt reported that on June 2, 2015 the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. The Committee was supportive of the sign portion of the proposal. The Committee did not voice any objections to the design of the tables and chairs. She reported that committee members shared staff concerns about the material and finish for the rail surrounding the café not being compatible with the character of the District. One member stated that painting it black may minimize concerns. During public comment at the CCRC meeting a community member stated that if approved, the design of the railing should not set precedent in the District. Following discussion and deliberations, the Committee recommended approval of the signage and seating, as proposed. Members were not in full agreement about the design of the railing. A recommendation was made for approval, on the condition that the railing is painted black. The applicants requested that consideration of their proposal be postponed following the CCRC meeting. They submitted alternative color/finish options for the rail on July 29th; however, their preferred alternative is the brushed aluminum finish, as currently installed.

Applicant Comment:

Anthony Polizzi, Jus Bar, explained the need for 42” railing with sidewalk café – they serve alcohol. He said that what they installed is not affixed to the building and it is similar to what other businesses in the neighborhood. He said he recognizes the historic nature of the building and he takes pride in that. He provided examples of other rail and seating styles in the district and commented on their diversity in design. He said he wanted something “bright and vibrant”.

Tiana Garrett, co-owner of Jus Bar, said that they have a large awning that dwarfs their space; they changed lighting to let people know they are there.

Mr. Polizzi said they looked at alternatives and there are cost issues. He said they want to preserve the open feel the existing rail allows. He said they haven't received any negative feedback from the community.

Ms. Barker asked if alternative fence color, such as green, had been explored.

Mr. Polizzi said that the building is flashy with turquoise trim; what they have installed is their preference.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Luoma stated that when he first saw it he thought it looked very modern, but then he couldn't picture a black, iron rail in this location (similar to the others in the district).

Ms. Barker stated that it feels raw and unfinished.

Mr. Luoma said that the tubular form is jarring.

Discussion ensued about the inappropriateness of the design of the rail for the building. A member stated that a more angular design would have been preferred. It was noted that the rail doesn't touch the building and can be easily removed. A Board member stated that cafes are important to the character of Columbia City; the benefit of pedestrian activation in the area was noted. Board members discussed ways to mitigate the design; there was general agreement that painting the rail black and tying the Certificate of Approval to this particular tenant might be an option. Board members did not want the community take this design choice as a precedent.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for signs and sidewalk café and planters located at 4864 Rainier Ave. S. on condition that rail be painted glossy black; rail to be removed due to damage or change of tenant; color and shape is not grandfathered.

This action is based on the following:

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

Relevant Columbia City Design Guidelines:

Guidelines/General

8. Emphasis should be given to maintaining the character of, and enhancing compatibility with, contributing buildings.

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.

8. Street Furniture. All elements of street furniture, including but not limited to street lights, benches, trash receptacles, and planters, shall be reviewed by the Review Committee and Board as to their specific compatibility with the District. Street furniture must be appropriately sized and sited to afford generous provisions for pedestrian flow.

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 #9 and #10

As a condition of this approval, the color of the railing shall be painted “glossy black” as presented as an alternative by the applicant and the railing will be removed if damaged and removed with the change of a tenant.

MM/SC/DB/RK 5:0:0 Motion carried.

080515.25

Kinnear Park
988 West Olympic Place
Proposed interpretive signage

Mr. Luoma recused himself.

Dean Koontz, HBB (landscape architect), explained that additional funds were left over from the project and they got approval from DOPAR to use the funds for three interpretive signs. Signs will go in the lower half of Kinnear Park where other improvements were made. He said that three signs are still in draft format but will focus on history, ecology, and birds. He said the signs are non-acrylic and won't yellow; they will use a high definition polymer for printing. He said that the history sign will not have a linear chronology. He said the signs should hold up well in the weather – the materials have been used in other locations with high exposure. He said the area is heavily forested and is in the shade of trees.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Doherty gave the ARC summary and said that Ms. Wine believed the signs had no negative impacts on the character of the park. She said that Mr. Sneddon had no problem with the signs but mentioned the non-linear chronology. Both members thought the proposal was reasonable.

Ms. Walker Brems agreed.

Mr. Ketcherside noted the posts will be black powder coated aluminum.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed interpretive signage at Kinnear Park, 988 West Olympic Place, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed interpretive signage does not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 304/01), as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is compatible with the massing, size and scale and 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 4:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Luoma recused himself.

080515.26

Franklin High School
3013 South Mt. Baker Boulevard
Proposed terra cotta replacement at exterior balconies

Ms. Doherty said she has been working closely with applicants on many projects proposed for Franklin High School; she has administratively reviewed a lot of in-kind repair and maintenance. The work proposed here is not in-kind and requires Board approval.

Rebecca Pheasant-Reis, explained that four Juliet balconies are failing; they are cracking, and are not tied back to the building – which poses a risk of failure, and have corroded deteriorated bracket hangers. She said they are located above major entry / exit doors, and have temporary protection in place. She said they will salvage and reinstall the front central units where possible, and will use GFRC where the units are damaged. She said new steel support for the top and new anchor for the bracket are proposed. She provided photos of examples of other GFRC work. She said that GFRC performs better seismically and is less brittle; she said it is durable for the weather here and is not as heavy as cast stone; she said that it will be on a similar maintenance cycle to the rest of the building. She said that terracotta repairs and replacement are ongoing.

Don Brubeck noted the safety concerns, and the timing issues associated with ordering terracotta; GFRC is more readily available. He said they looked at the long term view for the building and are following Secretary of Interior Standards. He said that they propose to replace 20 units in GFRC, five at each of the 4 balconies.

Responding to clarifying questions Rebecca explained that the hatched areas on the drawing illustrate areas to get GFRC replacement pieces.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Doherty provided the ARC summary. She said that Ms. Wine asked for clarification that the GFRC would be provided as individual units and not one large piece scored to look like separate pieces. The applicant clarified they would be individual pieces. Ms. Wine had asked that they provide samples showing that the GFRC matches the appearance of the existing terracotta. Ms. Doherty said the motion can be conditioned to come back to ARC, or to have the Staff review the samples. She said that GFRC and terracotta both have 15 – 20 year maintenance schedules. In response to a Board question, Ms. Doherty said she has reviewed other terracotta patching and in-kind replacement samples for Franklin, and is currently reviewing the roof tiles. She said the applicant has been working hard to find good matches, and has required the contractor to blend them in where appropriate.

Ms. Walker Brems asked about construction sequencing.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said they would have to remobilize on the project if they used terracotta and not GFRC.

Board members discussed how the GFRC weathers and there was general support for use of GFRC in this location because it can be matched well, and includes so few pieces as compared to the overall building.

Ms. Walker Brems had no problem with the proposal.

Mr. Luoma said that past discussions had focused on the concept of non-in-kind replacement, rather than the ability to match. He thought the approach was appropriate here.

Mr. Carter said no one else will know it isn't terracotta.

Mr. Ketcherside said that in this case GFRC is the most appropriate solution and appreciated the small incremental approach, rather than proposing to replace the whole balcony.

Ms. Walker Brems said it is okay here. She said they are great stewards of the school and this is a life safety issue.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed replacement of select terra cotta components at the four Juliet balconies using glass fiber reinforced concrete (GFRC), at Franklin High School, 3013 South Mt. Baker Boulevard, as per the application submittal; Staff will review sample of new material to make sure it closely matches with existing terracotta.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Report on Designation (LPB 337/86) as the proposed replacement material

(GFRC) will closely match the historic terra cotta in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities, as per Standard #6 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/DB 5:0:0 Motion carried.

080515.27

Pier 55
1101 Alaskan Way
Proposed awning with signage

Ms. Doherty briefly explained the proposal to re-skin the existing awning on the north side; the color will be burgundy and will have Red Robin's new logo. Tyson Boiko, Red Robin, said that additional building signs will be added later as part of a larger signage package but they want to get the new branding up in at least one location. Responding to questions Mr. Boiko said that the current awning has illumination; they will replace the fluorescent bulbs with LED. He said the lights are inside the awning.

Mr. Carter asked if the new logo was illuminated.

Mr. Boiko said that the graphic with yellow representation gives a 3-D effect, but that they are only vinyl applied onto the canvas.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Doherty said that ARC had no issues with the proposed work.

Ms. Walker Brems said the old awning never fit in and said they are just reskinning what is there.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed north side awning with signage, at Pier 55, 1101 Alaskan Way.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123859 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are 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/RK/NC 5:0:0 Motion carried.

080515.28

Northwest Rooms & International Fountain Pavilion
305 Harrison Street
Proposed exterior alterations, signage, lighting, and landscape

Steve Olson, SkB Architects, said that proposed landscape on the Republican side and tenant signage will come later. He said that they currently propose to remove concrete panels at the gathering space floor and went over packet details. On page 4 he noted that the locations of the overhead doors at the courtyard side have been shifted. He said they will retain a few more existing aluminum wall panels. He said reorganization of the three garage and two man doors will facilitate the inner workings of the space. On page 5 he noted the proposed metal panels above the courtyard area will be narrower than previously approved. He said there will be no oil canning; he said they propose the same color breakup but that the panels will be 1' wide with butt joints. He provided a material sample of the proposed paint scheme for the concrete panels and foundation. He said that the relief will be highlighted. He said the soffits and interior columns will be white. He said the roof membrane will be white; they are changing to a PVC system.

Cassie Hibbert, Costigan Integrated, said that three KEXP signs are proposed: one at 1st Avenue mounted on bar and stretched across a 10' bay; one on at the main entry on the courtyard side; and one on the south façade – simple black aluminum boxes with letters routed out and internally lit. She said the first two signs are the same. She said the larger south façade sign will be centered on the building vertically and horizontally so the Key Arena sign doesn't block the view. It will be attached with fasteners in the grout lines in between panels. She said the structure of the sign will match panels so it will fade away. She said the proposed area of donor tiles on the southwest corner are restricted by an existing historic plaque on the south elevation, and by the grade slope on 1st Avenue. She said that aluminum angles will be attached to a backer panel with donor tiles attached to that. She said that there will be three different sizes of tiles and referred to page 11.

Ms. Hibbert explained that 1st Avenue landscaping was part of a Phase II, but is now included in the application. She said that nothing will be at ground level – everything will be in raised planters. She said that the gabion boxes will have a concrete planter inside them. The pavers at the northwest corner will be permeable concrete. She said that 1st Avenue will have simple plantings in white and yellow.

Mr. Olson said that the existing lighting while original, is not energy efficient and does not have a consistent layout. He said they propose new fixtures that are very similar in appearance to the originals and will replace all lighting in a more regular lighting pattern – every twenty feet. He said the main entries will have new linear light fixtures tucked up in the eave. He said that the proposed antenna and dish on the roof are not visible from the street.

Denise Burnside, KEXP, said the original decorative paving at the courtyard will now be in a gathering space with furnishings. She said that the aggregate is uneven so they need to alter it; she said they will re-pour and use a light brushed concrete instead, and they will reuse the metal banding.

Ms. Hibbert said it will be a smooth brushed finish. Responding to clarifying questions she said that the planter boxes won't touch the building. Gabion boxes will also function as seating.

Mr. Olson said the music library is a key feature; they plan to use pervious concrete as sidewalk in that area to allow people to see in.

Mr. Luoma asked if the box lights in soffit are original.

Layne Cubell, Seattle Center, said they are original.

Mr. Luoma asked if the paver pattern repeated in the courtyard.

Ms. Burnside said they are the only ones left.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Doherty said that at ARC Mr. Sneddon and Ms. Wine's comments were mostly favorable. She reported that Ms. Wine had concerns about the size and location of the KEXP sign on the south side and its impact on the decorative concrete panels. Ms. Wine had also noted the change in proportion of multicolored metal panels as too busy, and she preferred the original proposal. Mr. Sneddon had commented that the gabion planters changed the character along the west elevation, but noted that they would be reversible. Mr. Sneddon also noted the importance of decorative concrete paving panels on the courtyard side and said it was important to continue to have a vestige of some kind there.

Ms. Walker Brems said she supported the application for the most part. She said the revised courtyard elevation isn't as successful as the original. She expressed concern with the size of the KEXP sign on the south façade. She said it dominates the façade and fights with the Key Arena sign, and is not at the main entry to the space. She was concerned with replacing the original lights which she said were distinct but noted the applicants did a good job finding something very similar.

Mr. Ketcherside said it felt like because there was a large wall they put up a large sign. He said that the library feels like the main corner of the building and Mercer is just one way to pass the building.

Mr. Carter said he had no problem with the south sign and noted it faces a big space. He said the Key Arena sign is large, so the KEXP sign is not overly large for that space. He said he preferred siting it per Option 1, centered on the wall.

Ms. Walker Brems said it is a beautiful building and the concrete wall relief pattern is being covered.

Ms. Barker said she likes Option 2, with the sign closer to the southwest corner, and said she supported the sign being reduced in size to match the width of a concrete panel.

Ms. Walker Brems noted the KEXP sign is larger than the Key Arena sign.

Mr. Luoma said the south sign should be proportionate within one of the concrete panels. He noted Mr. Sneddon's comments at ARC – where the decorative concrete paving panels are being filled in. He said they are salvaging the metal from the pavers. Speaking to the concrete wall panels, he said the main paint color is too dark.

He said it is good to celebrate the relief pattern, but the colors are not the right fit. He suggested reducing the size of the south sign to panel width and to bring it back to ARC for review. He said to exclude the south wall sign from the motion.

Ms. Doherty identified a few items of concern that the Board raised and asked them to clarify their thoughts on: exterior lighting, concrete paving panels, south sign, gabion planters, and concrete paint colors. There was general board support for the light fixtures, planters, and paint colors; concrete paving panels and south sign were recommended to go back to ARC.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site and building exterior alterations, and new lighting and signage, except that the south signage will return to ARC for approval of size and location, and the concrete paving panels will return to ARC for review of finish options at the Northwest Rooms & International Fountain Pavilion, 305 Harrison Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed site and exterior alteration, and new lighting and signage, do not adversely affect the building character as specified in Ordinance No. 124584, and are 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/RK 5:0:0 Motion carried.

080515.3 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

080515.32 Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse
2815 Elliott Avenue
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty explained the request for a three month extension and noted the recent change in property ownership.

Abby DeWeese, Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson, said the buyer was originally opposed to designation, but is now working closely with Staff on the negotiations.

Motion: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives of Ainsworth & Dunn Warehouse, 2815 Elliott Avenue, for three months.

MM/SC/DB/AL 5:0:0 Motion carried.

080515.4 BRIEFING

080515.41 University Methodist Episcopal Church Parsonage
4138 Brooklyn Avenue NE

Briefing on proposed addition, and exterior building and site alterations

PowerPoint in DON file.

Grace Kim, Schemata Workshop, provided site history and ownership. She explained the intent for the width to be in keeping with the scale of the neighborhood. She said they will remove the tree. She said the site wall and stairs will be in the right of way and will be removed. The foundation needs work; while this is being done the house will be moved forward to meet the street edge. She said it will be moved 4 ½' to the south. She provided a synopsis of the four briefings to date.

She said that the coloring and massing will address street frontage and the back building will serve as a foil. She said they looked at asymmetry in fenestration and said they preferred symmetrical because forced asymmetry didn't relate to the use and plan layouts. She provided massing perspective views and said that there will be cement board panels at different exposures and a gasket between old and new structure. She said that the proposed color scheme was derived from inspiration from the church's stained glass windows and exterior paint colors.

She went over proposed materials – brick frame in dark masonry, lap siding with big exposure and cement board in center. She said the courtyard will be an inviting active space with upper and lower patio as extension of indoor space. She said that they will put benches at street edge. She said that overhead strings of lights will be added to drop scale of space. She said they propose a free-standing canopy over part of the courtyard space. She said they will share trash enclosure with church and will add ADA ramp. She said the Sunday school class will have use of north patio.

Ms. Kim said that the existing house will be rehabilitated. She said they will repair and restore the existing ornamentation including dentil molding, all trim and most windows. She said they proposed to remove the north flue, and south brick chimney; stairs will be rebuilt and ADA access provided via modifications to porch. She said on the east elevation the stair will be removed. She said that the chimney is not structurally sound and would need to be rebuilt, and that it has no working fireplace inside. She said that the existing structure will connect to the new addition by a 3-story gasket on the back side of the existing; she said that they will remove a non-historic skylight, window, door, and stairs to accommodate. She said they propose modest signage on the west façade adjacent to the main entry.

Responding to questions about logistics of students moving in and out Maria Barrientos said that the units will be furnished for students; for a two week period the streets will be closed for move in/out. She said they have moved the bike storage entry; furniture will be brought into the addition on the south side, and the elevator can be accessed from there. She said that the Parsonage will be the student's daily entrance to the whole building – it will encourage student interaction.

Mr. Ketcherside said he likes the design but he questioned the practical aspects of finding the main entry at the Parsonage.

Ms. Barrientos said there is no other place to go in, and noted that the church is iconic and assists in wayfinding.

Ms. Barker asked about the rooftop element on the addition.

Ms. Kim said it has always been in their design; there is an enclosed party room that serves the deck, which is surrounded by a glass guardrail. She noted the solar array panels.

Ms. Barker said she thought the railing is a new element and asked how far back it sits from the edge of the roof.

Ms. Kim said that just a couple feet at the top of the railing would be visible.

Ms. Barrientos said there will be a 3' edge of greenscape outside the rail.

Ms. Barker asked about window survey matrix.

Ms. Barrientos said that approximately 95% of the windows in the existing building will be repaired. She said they will keep the single pane sashes and add interior storm windows.

Mr. Luoma asked about the “gasket” materials.

Ms. Kim said it will be the same siding as the as the addition and won't be very visible.

Mr. Luoma asked about the ADA ramp guardrail.

Ms. Kim said it will be wood with a residential character, but it is not fully designed yet.

Mr. Luoma asked about Sunday school use and how they will manage interaction between university kids and kindergartners.

Ms. Barrientos said that the student residents will not have access to the space on the north. She said this had been a dead space and the church wanted a more active kid space; this is a positive prospect for use of the space on the north side of the parsonage.

Ms. Doherty asked if this was the location of the church sanctuary's stained glass window.

Ms. Kim said yes, and noted there will be more solar access for the sanctuary.

Public Comment;

Ben Hellerstein, K & L Gates, said that the chimney no longer serves its original purpose; he cited examples of features removed at other landmark properties.

Mr. Luoma said they have successfully taken a difficult situation and done a good job rehabbing and reactivating the Parsonage. He expressed concern with removal of the chimney and noted the aesthetics and textures on the south façade. He said the proposal has quite a loss of historic fabric there – replacing two windows with two

doors – and that to lose the chimney degrades the architectural character. He said that it is great expense to move the building, and rebuilding the chimney is not out of bounds for this project. He said it could be a nice relationship with brick to façade of new. He said that overall the project is great – the courtyard space, front porch, and minimized visual impacts of added ramp.

Mr. Carter said it looks good but that he worried about the loss of the chimney; he said it is part of the fabric of the building. He referenced an earlier application where the Board required the chimney to be rebuilt. He said that everything else looks good.

Ms. Barker said that the new free-standing canopy element conflicts. She said that it is more appropriate to keep the chimney there. She noted the clutter of furniture and canopy. She said the chimney should anchor the courtyard. She said to make sure the rooftop railing is not visible. She said the exterior paint colors for the Parsonage are good. She said that the light color on the new building looks dirty and needs a warmer color. She said she appreciated the summary on the window repairs. She said they should preserve the brick chimney. She said to increase the cornice on the east side of the addition – it needs more presence as seen from the Ave.

Mr. Ketcherside said it is a fantastic project. He said to maintain the brick chimney – it is an important element. He said that when originally designed the location of windows etc. were organized around the chimney, and are part of the balance of the building. He said the free-standing canopy detracts from the historic structure and asked for a couple of alternative options.

Ms. Barrientos said the canopy is needed programmatically.

Ms. Walker Brems suggested planting a tree instead – it becomes a natural canopy.

Mr. Luoma said glass is important or it will always be dark. He suggested that more temporary things could be put up as needed.

Ms. Walker Brems suggested fabric; possibly sail cloth strung between the building faces. She said that kids will think using the Parsonage is cool – it is a great marketing tool. She said the proposed canopy doesn't work - it detracts from the courtyard. She suggested the potential to further modify the eave on the east side of the Parsonage, to improve the connection between existing and new. She said it is a great project. She said she loves the symmetry of the addition.

Ms. Barrientos said they will keep working on the design of the canopy and said it is important programmatically.

Mr. Luoma suggested something more residential in character.

Ms. Walker Brems suggested a cantilever off the new building.

Ms. Walker Brems left at 7:45 pm.

Ms. Doherty asked about the project timeline and said the Board cannot act until SEPA the determination is noticed. She said the applicant might want to make a short briefing to ARC for the outstanding design items.

Mr. Luoma said the canopy should be compatible with the character of the parsonage. He said no faux historic; wood instead of metal and glass; and a form that balances between modern and historic.

080515.4 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator