



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 42/17

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday, January 18, 2017 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Kathleen Durham
Robert Ketcherside
Kristen Johnson
Jeffrey Murdock
Matthew Sneddon
Steven Treffers
Emily Vyhnanek

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Rebecca Frestedt
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Deb Barker
Jordon Kiel
Julianne Patterson

Jeffrey Murdock called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

011817.1 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

011817.11 Columbia City Landmark District
3818 S. Edmunds St. – Dolores Apartments
Proposed exterior alterations

Ms. Frestedt explained that the application is requesting new exterior paint colors, replacement of the awning fabric and replacement of the existing aluminum windows with new vinyl windows. Exhibits included plans, photographs and samples. The building was constructed in 1962. It is located outside of the Columbia City National Register District. On January 3, 2017, the Columbia City Review Committee reviewed the application. Following discussion of the paint colors and window options that had been explored, the Committee acknowledge that the building is a noncontributing building and determined that the work is reversible. The Committee recommended approval, as proposed.

Don Olund, property owner, said he is seeking permission to upgrade the building. He stated that he is not a fan of vinyl windows, but that they are the best option for this building due to its age and the construction of the existing windows. He said the windows will fit into the existing window frame; they built the color scheme around the windows. He said it is a marblecrete building and it is impossible to patch and blend; they will change the color scheme on the building but will retain the chevron details. He said the rear of the building has a stucco finish that covers the edge of the window. He said on the front they will frame around the window; the window will sit inside the jamb. Responding to questions he explained that the chevrons are marblecrete as well – they are just divided by wood trim and a fascia board on top.

Ms. Durham arrived at 3:40 pm.

Mr. Olund said the code calls for fabric to be flameproof and the striped material they found did not meet this standard, so they went with a solid color. He said they will do all work in sequence.

Mr. Murdock said this building is adjacent to other contributing buildings – the Shirley Marvin is near – and it will blend in with others.

Mr. Sneddon said it is not contributing and there is minimal impact to others.

Mr. Murdock said he wished that the marblecrete could be restored, but he understands why they took this route.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval exterior alterations and paint colors at 3818 S. Edmunds St., as proposed. This action is based on the following:

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

Guidelines/Specific

2. Building Materials and Fixtures. Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District. Exterior light fixtures shall be in keeping with the historic character of the District.

3. Building Surface Treatments. Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces.

Painted surfaces shall be:

- a. Repainted with the original historic color(s) of the building, provided that the business or property owner obtains a professional color analysis; or
- b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an "historic colors" palette that may be useful as a guide. The Board Coordinator also has a palette of historic colors that may be used as reference.

10. Awnings/Canopies/Marquees. Marquees, awnings, and canopies will be encouraged at street level. Shiny, high-gloss materials are not appropriate. Distinctive architectural features shall not be covered, nor shall installation damage the structure. Awnings may be installed on upper levels where appropriate.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 & 10

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

011817.12

Fischer Studio Building
1519 Third Avenue
Proposed signage

Ms. Sordt explained that Sprint purchased Radio Shack which prompted a sign change. She said there is no sign plan for this building; what is proposed is in keeping with existing signage and the existing blade sign won't be changed. She said the commercial spaces, like the residential above, are condos.

Mr. Treffers said that ARC reviewed and the storefront is not original so there is no impact to historic materials.

Mr. Murdock said it is straightforward.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Johnson commented that it is reasonable.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed signage alterations to the Fischer Studio Building, 1519 Third Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 123382, 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/RK/KJ 7:0:0 Motion carried.

011817.13

Moore Theatre and Hotel Building

1932 Second Avenue

Proposed window replacement and exterior masonry repair

David Allen explained they will repair masonry on the front and north, replace west side windows with the same windows as put in at Palladian; he said they look more original than what is there now. He said they have budget constraints and will focus on safety issues.

John Sharin, Finish Touch Masonry, guided board members through plan details. He said they will clean the brick and terracotta masonry; tuckpoint all masonry; secure masonry with helical veneer anchors; patch, repair cracks and spalls; replace glazing on brick to replicate glazed brick; clean lintels and sills; caulk sky facing terracotta joints; apply clear penetrate sealer to all brick (they won't do this if lime putty mortar is there); prep and repaint in the same color all painted elements around windows; he said the same surround will remain on windows; repair terracotta and wood elements on cornice and decorative bands. He said they will address life safety issues and open voids. He said they will stop water intrusion at parapet, repair and seal. He said they will patch, repair, repaint trim and will replicate what they can't reuse. He said they will keep the trim and the pulleys from the window. He said that the proposed windows are close to what was originally there.

Mr. Allen said that coloring will be matched for consistency.

Ms. Durham asked about the proposed brick glazing.

Mr. Sharin said it is to replicate the glaze – it is not fired – they will use Edison Coating which seals as it replicates the glaze. He said it will have sheen and will match terracotta and will be durability. He said they will leave as much original glaze as possible but want to protect the terracotta clay.

Mr. Murdock asked if they will scrape for original color.

Mr. Allen said they did and discovered lead. He said they will stay with the cheaper route to what it looks like now – to protect building and stop intrusion.

Mr. Murdock asked if the new windows are paintable.

Mr. Sharin said they are pre-colored.

Mr. Treffers said to match the window frame bronze as closely as possible.

Susan Jones said it will be powdercoated a dark bronze.

Mr. Murdock asked about missing elements.

Mr. Sharin said that the voids will be put back in; some cornice metal elements will be fixed if possible or will be faux if not.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Mr. Sharin said that they will rake out enough mortar to have it tested to find out what it is N or O. They will use no higher than 750.

Mr. Treffers said there will be no alteration to window openings – they are using the original openings. He advised the applicant to use the gentlest cleaning method possible. He said workers should understand constraints of PSI and be qualified to know what they are doing.

Mr. Murdock said there are a lot of unknowns and they should work closely with staff if they run into issues.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations to the Moore Theater and Hotel Building, 1932 Second Avenue, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 114773, 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*.

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

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

011817.14 Seattle First Baptist Church
1111 Harvard Avenue
Proposed entry alterations

Tabled.

011817.15

Queen Anne Library

400 West Garfield Street

Proposed alterations to windows, skylight, and chimney

Matt Inpanbutr, SHKS, explained the exterior repairs and maintenance to the URM chimney, windows, and skylight. He said that to repair damage to chimney they propose to disassemble it and reconstruct with reinforced concrete block and then re-use the brick as a veneer. He said they will restore the original terracotta chimney pot. He said that the original windows were removed in 1988; the replacement windows had faux leaded came applied to the exterior glass pane with an adhesive which was failing, as are the perimeter window seals. He said that different window replacement assemblies were explored and they propose to use existing wood sashes with a fixed exterior pane and removable interior leaded pieces to match existing. He said the lead will be removable to allow for cleaning and a spacer will be used to allow air circulation. He said the windows will have a proposed 50 – 100-year life. He said there will be no change to the sash thickness or the overall appearance.

He said that in 1914 the building had a pyramidal skylight, and now there is a low slope skylight in its place that is failing. He said they propose a new skylight similar to the original form per the 1913 drawings. He said the steeper slope will perform much better than the current condition and require less maintenance.

Mr. Inpanbutr said that the west entry door was added in 1988; they propose to replace it with aluminum clad wood to be more similar to the other existing door. New hardware will match existing finishes.

Mr. Murdock asked about the space below the skylight.

Mr. Inpanbutr said it was a reading room but now it is a computer lab. The skylight is not visible from inside.

Mr. Treffers said that ARC reviewed and supported the application. He said the Queen Anne Historical Society supports it as well.

Mr. Murdock said it is well-researched and a good solution for these windows.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Johnson said it is an interesting solution for the windows and she appreciated the effort to save and rebuild the chimney.

Mr. Murdock said the skylight addition is appropriate.

Mr. Sneddon said the chimney is an important part of the original design. He said they found a good solution for the windows.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations to the Queen Anne Library, 400 West Garfield Street, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 121101, 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/ST/EV 7:0:0 Motion carried.

011817.16

Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District – Building 9
7101 62nd Avenue NE
Proposed exterior rehabilitation and site improvements

See PowerPoint in DON file for details.

Mr. Treffers disclosed that Kate Krafft, a member of the Sand Point application review committee, is his mother-in-law. There were no objections to his participation, by the Board members or the Owner.

Pam Derry, Tonkin Architects, explained that Building 9 was the original naval barracks and dining hall.

Alisa Luber, Mercy Housing NW, explained the proposed adaptive reuse of the building for 148 workforce family housing units. She said this will be the largest affordable housing development in Seattle. She said they have assembled financing and must start work in June to beat rising interest rates and use \$30 million in Historic Tax Credits. She appreciated ARC guidance.

Ms. Derry said the 800-foot-long building is a contributing to the local historic district and is the National Register district. She said the time of significance was 1929 through WWII. She said it was built in three phases and she noted uses that changed after WWII. She said that NE 74th access will be restricted and used for emergency vehicle exit only.

She said the central section east facade had the original windows replaced in the 1980s and awnings added, and fence was added to roof. She said they propose new light wells to provide more light to the basement; they will keep the window head height and lower the window sill to get more light in for the childcare space. She said the original doors were replaced. She said there are two existing ramps for accessibility and they propose to add another at the north (east side) between the existing stairs. She said they will use similar design that will meet current code.

She said there are grade challenges on the west side and they propose to level the area to provide parking and accessible entries, but will preserve the loading docks. She said there will be new lightwell and new window to look out to the new enclosed play space. They will smooth out grading and add an accessible path. She said they will enlarge lightwells to allow basement housing.

Ms. Derry said that there will be no basement units on the north. She said they will provide access entrance for east side. She said they will preserve the original 1929 loading dock to become a patio but will remove the non-original roof cover. She said they will provide access to the basement. She said that transformers on the west side and Building 27 will be used as trash enclosure area and Building 42 will be trash collection area, storage, and trash compactor space.

Karen Kiest, landscape architect, went over proposed landscape details and said that the formal and utilitarian landscaping is defined by rows of Deodar Cedar trees. She said they will remove everything except Japanese Maple and a significant row of Deodar Cedars in the 5' wide strip immediately adjacent to the building. She said they will add more color – flowering evergreen shrubs and blooming deciduous trees. She said on the west there will be open landscaped courtyards, slope and ADA walkways. The parking lot landscape will have 900' of hedge. She said original Poplars will be removed; she noted concern about their viability and life safety issues. She said that the plantings they propose have no berries and are non-invasive.

Ms. Derry said that the railings are in bad shape and not to code; they will replace them with black wrought iron in reference to what was there. She said that there are no original doors on the west; on the east, there are original doors and transoms. She said they will restore original doors and transoms; she noted there are three original doors on the north as well. She said that the propose commercially available light fixtures; they don't have the budget to create a match to original. She said that on the east lights will stay as they are. She said that there are no existing lights on the west side and that options were provided to ARC. She said they are energy efficient and focus down. She said pole lights are proposed, LED striplights and wall mounted LEDs.

She said that the building's aluminum windows were installed in the 1980s and are at the end of their life. She said they proposed to replace them with aluminum clad wood and have had much discussion with DAHP and the NPS. She said over 800 windows will be replaced. She went over window types. She said at the dormers these have always been a square headed sash with a detail that makes them appear to have an arched upper sash as seen from the exterior.

Ms. Derry said that at the center portion east facade they can't replicate the original historic window due to their immense size, so they propose a fixed window with a

center divider to look like a cross rail. She said that there are three existing skylights from the 1940s; they are falling apart and are not salvageable. She said they need a 3-hour fire separation from the adjacent north and south wings, and they propose to keep the gabled shape but with a smaller middle one. She said new HVAC will be installed on the center roof but is not very visible from the adjacent parking and sidewalk. She said on the west side they will add skylights. She said that there are only a few remaining copper gutters, downspouts and collector boxes. These will be removed and all will be replaced with aluminum profiles to match the original features. They will remove the non-historic fire escapes and the chain link fence on the roof. She said that they will remove wood roof louver boxes and will use a similar metal box to capture numerous roof vents. She explained where the proposed elevator penthouses will be placed; they will be gabled shape roofs with same roof shingling to blend in.

Mr. Sneddon asked why they aren't using multi-light windows.

Ms. Derry said it is cost-prohibitive; they are doing over 800 windows.

Mr. Sneddon asked how many windows will be elongated to provide daylight to basement.

Ms. Derry said about 40. Responding to questions she explained that the glazing has a slight greenish appearance from the energy efficient coating.

Mr. Murdock asked about railing types and what is proposed.

Ms. Derry said that most are from the 1930s and are on the east. The railings on the south end are less ornate. She said there is no consistency to the railing designs and they are in such bad shape they are not salvageable. She said the picket openings are too wide to meet code. The new ones will be the same height. She said that the middle the doors are recessed and they will put in a soffit light.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the historic significance of the landscaping, alterations over time, what is being lost with what is proposed.

Ms. Kiest said the design focused on the Cedars that defined the streetscape. She said the east elevation is the formal entry / façade so there was a degree of formality. The shrubs overgrew over time; the element of formality is character defining and appropriate for Colonial Revival style. She said they are retaining the Japanese Maples and the Arbor Vitae.

Ms. Doherty asked if the new planting plan was intended to recreate the original scale of the foundation plantings.

Ms. Kiest said yes, they are recreating the same formality and scale.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Treffers said that at ARC he had some concern about differentiation of new features – canopies, elevator roof extension, Building 42, addition of wall – and the creation of false history. He said ARC appreciated the more modern railings as they were consistent and subordinate to the character of the building. He said it is clear what is new and what is old.

Ms. Johnson said the light fixtures were previously discussed a lot. She said that overall this is an amazing use for this building.

Ms. Durham said what is proposed is thoughtful; it is consistent and workable and celebrates what is there. She said it is an opportunity for good use of the building.

Mr. Murdock said he walked through the building 16 years ago. He said it is a good rehabilitation. He said he was always worried about the building and is glad it will be used for housing – it will add so much to Sand Point and to the City. He supported the application as it is.

Ms. Vyhnanek said it is thoughtful and pays homage to what was there in its adaptive reuse. She supported proposals being made. She said this will bring lots of life to this area.

Mr. Sneddon said he wished for the multi-light windows but that he understands and it could be addressed 50 years down the road. He said he was hesitant about the landscaping because they are losing the setting and feeling of military formality. He said there is enough material left of the basement windows after extending them to convey what they were. He said it is nice to have the hierarchy of railings because they told what the important places were and he appreciates having things to remind you of the past.

Mr. Treffers said the nice thing is that a lot of these things are reversible and there will be opportunities to do better later. There will not be long lasting damage.

Mr. Sneddon asked about the original use of the basement.

Ms. Derry said it was a bowling alley but was also used for bars, recreation, and storage.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed building rehabilitation and site improvement at Buildings 9 & 42, 7101 62nd Avenue NE and 7700 Sand Point Way NE, respectively.

The proposal as presented January 18, 2017 does not adversely affect the features or characteristics as specified in Ordinance No. 124850, and complies with the Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation, and Sand Point Naval Air Station Landmark District Design Guidelines as follows:

SOI Standards for Rehabilitation - #9

Relevant District Guidelines for:

BUILDINGS & STRUCTURES

Windows

- Retaining, preserving and in some cases restoring the original historic fenestration pattern (window placement pattern) should be a priority.
- An in-depth survey identifying the condition of the existing window frames and sash should be undertaken prior to any consideration of projects involving the replacement or alteration of window sash or window units.
- Wooden window sash, frames and trim should be repaired by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing deteriorated features or components. Such repair may include the in-kind replacement of those parts that are missing or extensively deteriorated. Consideration may be given to the use of substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility and visual impacts.
- Replacement of historic sash and frame members may be undertaken if it can be demonstrated that the window is too deteriorated to repair and all possible repair and upgrading options have been explored. Replacement sash, pane configuration and frame members should closely match the size and design of the historic sash and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility as long as the essential design and character of the window is replicated.
- In order to comply with current energy code requirements every effort should be made to develop design solutions that do not radically change, obscure or alter primary elevations, character-defining features or materials especially fenestration patterns and intact historic window units. Code compliant replacement sash, pane configuration and frame members should closely match the size, configuration and design of the historic sash and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility as long as the essential design and character of the window is replicated.
- Restoration of an entire missing original window or replacement of an existing non-historic window may be undertaken. Replacement sash, pane configuration and frame members should be based on available historical, pictorial or physical documentation, and should closely match the size and design of the original historic sash and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility assessment (including life-cycle cost analysis) as long as the essential design and character of the original window type is replicated.

Entrances & Porches

- Retaining, preserving and in some cases reestablishing original or historic entrances, entry doors and porches should be a priority.
- Replacement of an historic or original door may be undertaken if it can be demonstrated that the door is too deteriorated to repair and/or function, and all

possible repair and upgrading options have been explored. Replacement doors should closely match the size and design of the historic door and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility as long as the essential design and character of the door is replicated.

- Restoration of an entire missing original door or replacement of an existing non-historic door may be undertaken. Replacement door products should be based on available historical, pictorial or physical documentation and should closely match the size and design of the original or historic door and frame members. Consideration may be given to the use of compatible substitute materials based on technical and economic feasibility as long as the essential design and character of the original door is replicated.
- The installation of new awnings, canopies or marquees at building entrances is discouraged; however, may be considered if the proposed element and method of attachment will not radically change, obscure or destroy primary elevations, character-defining features, materials or finishes. The replacement or reconstruction of missing historic awnings, canopies or marquees shall be allowed. Internally-lit awnings or shiny, high-gloss materials will not be allowed.

Roofs/Roof Features

- Retaining and preserving historic roof forms and their functional and decorative features should be a priority.
- Roof features including roofing materials should be repaired by reinforcing the historic materials. Extensively deteriorated or missing materials or features should be replaced in-kind. If it can be demonstrated that using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, a compatible substitute material may be considered.
- An entire roof feature (i.e. soffit, dormer, chimney) may be partially reconstructed or replaced in-kind if it can be demonstrated that it is too deteriorated to repair. The replacement feature should closely replicate the essential form, design and character of the original feature.

Existing Non-Historic Additions/Alterations

- Consideration may be given to the removal of non-historic additions or alterations based on available historical, pictorial or physical documentation.
- Consideration may be given to the alteration of non-historic additions or prior alterations based on available historical, pictorial or physical documentation.
- Any new construction (other than reconstruction) associated with the removal or alteration of non-historic elements should be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible with the adjacent historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion of the building.

New Additions/Exterior Alterations

- Additions or alterations may be necessary or desired in order to adapt a building to a new or an expanded use.

- Such alterations should be considered only after full evaluation has been given to adapting functional changes within the existing interior spaces.
- Exterior additions or alterations should not radically change, obscure or destroy primary elevations, character-defining features, materials or finishes.
- New construction should be clearly differentiated from the historic building such that a false sense of historic appearance is not created *and* should not diminish the historic property or its character-defining features.
- Design for new construction may be contemporary in character or may directly reference design motifs or proportions drawn from the historic building.
- Design of new construction should be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationships of solids and voids, and color.
- Any new building addition should be constructed in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic building will be intact.
- New windows may be installed and new window openings on a rear or secondary elevation in order to accommodate a new or expanded use. Window size and proportion should be compatible with the overall design and character of the building but it should not duplicate historic features or create a false historic appearance.
- Rooftop additions when required for a new use (and allowable by code) should be set back from the wall plane and parapet and must be as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from adjacent streets and sidewalks.
- Rooftop mechanical equipment does not necessarily need to be screened, unless required by code. The screening of rooftop mechanical equipment shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Paint Colors

- An established palette of appropriate paint colors, typical to the district, was researched and formally identified in 1997 (See Appendix B). The purpose of this paint palette is to unify the landmark district buildings and reinforce the historic character of the district.

New Signage & Wall Mounted Lighting

- New wall mounted signage or wall sconce type light fixtures (or security systems) should not radically change, obscure, or destroy primary elevations, character-defining features, materials or finishes. Careful attention must be given to attachment methods that will not damage historic building fabric.
- New signage or wall sconce type light fixtures should be clearly differentiated from historic signage such that character-defining signage is not diminished or a false historic appearance created.
- New signage should adhere to *SMC 23.55.032 Signs in the Sand Point Overlay District*.
- Specific signage designs and light fixtures shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Utilitarian gooseneck type fixtures may be appropriate in some cases.

Accessibility

- Every effort should be made to comply with barrier-free accessibility requirements with design solutions that do not radically change, obscure or alter primary elevations, character-defining features or materials.
- If it is technically infeasible to meet accessibility code requirements and adhere to the above guideline, alternative design solutions are allowed by code.
- The design of new or additional means of access should be compatible with the design of the individual historic building and its building site.
- New ramps, guardrails and handrails should be clearly differentiated from the historic building such that character-defining features are not diminished or a false historic appearance created. However, it is important that new work be designed with characteristics sympathetic to the historic building and be based on the established palette of design elements and construction materials.

BUILDING SITES & DISTRICT SETTING

Existing Historic Landscape & Site Features

- Various historic landscape and site features including walkways, paths, vegetation, grading, retaining walls and borders are important to the character of the adjacent buildings, their locale and the district setting. Every effort should be made to protect and regularly provide maintenance measures to preserve these features and their relationship to adjacent buildings and the district setting.
- Concrete or masonry features should be repaired by patching, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing damaged or deteriorated areas. Concrete repair work should replicate the old work in strength, composition, color and texture. Masonry elements should be repaired in-kind with careful attention given to proper mortar joint type, mortar removal and mix.
- Every effort should be made to develop design solutions that do not radically change, obscure or alter a contributing object in order to comply with a new adjacent use or site development requirements.

New Landscape or Site Features

- New landscape features or site features should not radically change, obscure or destroy primary elevations, character-defining features, nearby materials or finishes.
- New site features should be clearly differentiated from historic site features such that character-defining features are not diminished or a false historic appearance created. All new site work should be designed in character with the historic building and be based on established design elements and materials.
- New plant materials should be selected from the established *Sand Point Annotated Historic Plant List* (Vegetation Management Plan, 2001) provided by Parks.

- New plant materials should be similar in mass to existing or historic plantings on the building site.

New Lighting

- Low path or pedestrian lighting shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis according to potential visual impacts to adjacent character-defining site features or the district setting.
- Consideration may be given to the use of a more utilitarian and simple lighting fixture type for minor roadways, less prominent parking areas located away from major streetscapes and/or behind buildings.
- Consideration may be given to adapting the established replicated historic light fixture types to changing technologies that increase energy efficiency.

New Fencing & Screening

- The introduction of new fencing or screening is generally discouraged.
- Galvanized metal chain link fencing is a well-established element within the historic district. The introduction of black-coated chain link fencing may be appropriate in some locations.
- Screening of visually intrusive service areas, utility equipment or storage functions will be allowed. Screening should not have the potential to obscure or destroy views of historic resources, view corridors or nearby site features.
- Fencing for safety or security purposes will be allowed. Fencing should not have the potential to obscure or destroy views of historic resources, view corridors or nearby site features.
- Free-standing ground level mechanical/electrical equipment does not necessarily need to be screened, unless required by code. The screening of mechanical or electrical equipment with galvanized metal chain link fencing shall be allowed.
- Screening design undertaken in association with new construction projects should be simple and utilitarian in character with design elements and materials based on specific location, visibility and adjacency factors.
- Specific fencing or screening designs shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Accessibility

- Every effort should be made to comply with barrier-free accessibility requirements with design solutions that do not radically change, obscure or alter views of primary elevations, structures, or historic landscape and site features.
- If it is technically infeasible to meet accessibility code requirements and adhere to the above guideline, alternative design solutions are allowed by code.
- The design of new or additional means of access should be compatible with the design of the adjacent historic buildings and the character of the site and setting.

- New ramps, guardrails and handrails should be clearly differentiated from the design of nearby historic buildings such that character-defining features are not diminished or a false historic appearance created. However, it is important that new work be designed with characteristics sympathetic to the district buildings and setting and be based on the established palette of design elements and construction materials.

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

MM/SC/KD/EV 7:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Durham left at 5:40 pm.

011817.2 DESIGNATION

011817.21 Mama's Mexican Kitchen
2234 2nd Avenue

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, said the former Mama's is no longer there and use is not landmarked. He said that the interiors were added at the last minute and there is nothing there.

David Peterson, Nicholson Kovalchick, prepared and presented the report (PowerPoint in DON file). He said his focus would be responding to board questions at the nomination meeting regarding the site. He said the building was constructed in 1924 by George W. Stoddard for Henry and Mable Shuett as a commercial investment property. He said Marjorie Shuett married Stoddard who did the design as a favor to his father in law. He said this was at the tail end of the regrade and there was lots of change in the neighborhood. He said there were three shops in the front and light industrial / heavy commercial in the back. He said it is unreinforced masonry, post and beam construction with three bays on the east and west facades and six on the north. He said there are no original drawings. He said the first tenant was auto repair but he didn't know if it was built for that purpose.

Mr. Peterson provided photos of the building today and noted changes: the center bay is complete altered on the west façade but two others are intact with recessed door entry and transoms above. He said drop ceiling in the south shop obscures transoms on the inside. He said that on the Bell Street elevation the interior wall was building in between the 2nd and 3rd bays and the front belonged to the restaurant. He said that Mama's eventually occupied all three bays in front. He said that on the alley side there is no trim piece above the windows – it is less formal. He said the doorway at the back was replaced from the side. He said the post and beam supports are still there in the two bays.

Mr. Peterson said Stoddard had a large body of work – Winthrop Hotel, Fox Garage, Yesler Terrace, U. W. Husky Stadium, residences among others. He said there are similar buildings in Belltown that have three shops in front and heavy commercial in the back: the Crocodile, Two Bells, 401 Cedar, Roc La Rue. He said that on the park site across the alley: in 1917 it was undeveloped; in 1937 it was a parking lot and gas station; in 1979 it became Regrade Park. He said there are lots of windows for lots of light and

he noted there are multiple auto-related buildings nearby: the Bergman was a dealership or garage. He said he couldn't prove or disprove the labor connection to Mama's but it was logical people would meet at the Labor Temple rather than here.

Mr. Murdock said that for a good percentage of the building's life it has been a garage.

Mr. Peterson said that the building doesn't meet A, B, or E. He said it meets C but lacks the character and represents the typical rather than the significant. He said there have been various tenants over time with auto repairs being there 50% of its life and 44% of the time heating and plumbing, sign and electrical tenants. He said that the focus is on the building rather than the occupants. He said the building is a simple eclectic commercial style that has been altered over time. He said it is not an exceptional example of the style or period or method of construction. He said it is not especially visible because of the trees and there are similar other buildings nearby.

Mr. McCullough said the building is not unique or special and there are many others that are better. He said it is not a special garage building and it has house lots of different uses. He said it was not a special meeting place for labor leaders. He said it is an average building so the bar needs to be higher; five of the 12 bays have been altered. He said the building is just a storefront. He said there should be a higher bar and there is no integrity.

Mr. Treffers asked for photos of the interior.

Mr. Peterson provided current photos but said he had no historical interior photos.

Mr. Murdock said that the corner has always been a café and he noted the continuity of that use over the life of the building.

Mr. Sneddon asked if the fire wall was load bearing.

Mr. Peterson said it is not.

Mr. Sneddon noted that it is removable.

Responding to questions Mr. Peterson said that the garage door on the alley side is not original to that location but it is original to the building. He said that Bell Street Auto Repair was shown to be a tenant there in 1924.

Mr. Treffers asked if the 1st and 3rd bays are intact.

Mr. Peterson said that the front doors are not original but the transom is. The center storefront has changed but the other transom is there. He said the brick bulkheads are original.

Mr. Ketcherside said the alley is most striking with its large windows. He said there is not enough on the interiors to warrant designation even though the original masonry and light industrial support beams are visible. He said the front elevation has the same rhythm as in an old photo; he noted the far bay is most intact.

Public Comment:

Tiffany Jorgensen, Historic Belltown, said Belltown is a blue-collar neighborhood. She said the one-story commercial building has high level of integrity and still serves its original purpose. She said it still has original sash windows, transoms, original slope uncovered bricks. She said the largest change is the main doors. She said the west side changes are easily reversible. She said the building meets criteria C, D, and F. She said it meets the double significance of C with its auto-oriented use. She said that three sides are visible and the building is prominent in the heart of this urban village. She noted the association with the regrade and the working class and said it still shows that.

Steve Hall, Historic Belltown, said the building has integrity; it is intact and a beautiful building. He said that it meets Criterion F in that it is an important part of the Belltown identity. He said that this is in a potential historic district with this building as an anchor. He said the signs should be designated as well. He said this provides a rich feeling to the neighborhood.

David Levenson said he came to the area as a union representative. He said they were not allowed to drink at the hall so they came here a lot. He said the corner is still there and is intact. He said it is important in meaning and feeling – it feels the same.

Evan Cliffthorne, Executive Director, Project Belltown, said they are working with various constituencies. He said they have explored this block's history and every single person knows Mama's. He supported designation.

Beck Prigate, Historic Belltown, supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. She said there has been much change and this building has been an anchor in the neighborhood for 90 years. She said it is one of the best examples of an auto garage. She said the building is a wayfinding point in the area. She said it is part of Belltown working class history – day labor, night shifters, etc.

Tarik Scott supported designation on Criterion F; he noted the prominent location in Belltown.

Keith Bantock said that although the business changed hands it has been Mama's since 1977. He said the structure is essential to Belltown for identity. He noted changes in the City and said to preserve the spiritual heart of the neighborhood. He noted it was an early work of Stoddard.

Eugenia Woo, Historic Seattle, said that there is nowhere in the Ordinance that has defined integrity issue. She said it doesn't have to be unaltered to be a landmark and noted the Fashioncraft Building had all its windows changed out. She supported designation and said the form is still there. She noted the association with Mama's since 1978 and its long history of the building as part of the cultural and economic life of the area. She said the building is adaptable as evidenced by all the uses over the years.

Brooke Best said there doesn't have to be a specific level of integrity or bar to reach – not many buildings that age are flawless. She said it is utilitarian and wouldn't have been able to survive this long. She noted the similar situation at the Crescent Hamm building and Easy Street. She said this is a strong proud building in the neighborhood; it is the heart and soul of the neighborhood. She said that even without Mama's the building

would still be identifiable. She said the building has the integrity to convey its significance.

Merilee Sherman said that this block is significant to the heart of Belltown – like the Wayne Apartments and the Crocodile. She said the history and heart are intact and there is a full block of significant cultural reflection there. She noted the association with low income – working class history. She said it is a building for ordinary folks and reflects the Belltown working class.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on criteria D and F. He said there are others of the same type to compare it to – the Crocodile which more easily meets C and 400 Cedar which is clearly outstanding – he didn't want to say one is better than others. He said that Belltown was an auto neighborhood and there were others; he said there were many parking stations in neighborhood which also offered service. He said this building was built with so many large windows on the alley. He said there is high integrity on the alley side which now faces a park. He said the building maintains its basic character and shape.

Mr. Treffers thanked Mr. Peterson for his research and presentation. He said he read the nomination report and minutes as well as context statements for Belltown and Queen Anne. He said that significance in the Ordinance is its ability to convey what it is. He said criteria A, B, and E aren't applicable here. He thanked the community who he said are an important part of the story. He supported Criterion D and said the building tells the story of the City and neighborhood and what is unique about Belltown as a working-class neighborhood. He said there are other buildings that look like this – that is part of the story of the neighborhood – commercial storefront and light industrial in rear. He said that it meets Criterion D as it embodies its period of 1920s development. He said that it meets Criterion F as well but it only has to meet one criterion to be designated. He noted the features of the building – single story with three commercial bays, recessed entrances, and light industrial in the back. He said the storefront in the middle is altered and the interior changes are characterizations of use. The building is 100 years old and has remarkable integrity. He said all the bays are there, windows are there; it tells the story and has enough features to do that. He did not support designation of interior.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on Criterion D but included C and F as well. He said the building displays the visible characteristics of its style it doesn't have to be exceptional or unique. He said it is a significant typology and a good representation of it. He said it tells about Belltown, Seattle and urbanization nationwide. He noted the stepped parapet, coping, transoms, brick pattern work above transoms. He noted the association with the regrade and imagining what the new Belltown will look like. He said the building provides a snapshot of how cities changed to accommodate the auto and its servicing stations. He said cars needed servicing and apartments needed garages. He said this was an important moment in Seattle. He said there are a mix of building types in Belltown. He said it meets Criterion F and captures its original purpose as a commercial storefront and service space. He said it caters to a mixed-use community – the same types of uses as when it was built in 1924. He said it evokes the same feeling over a long period of time and you can still determine when it was built. He said the shop side conveys significance as industrial shop.

Ms. Johnson said it is a typical utilitarian building about which she would parse her language more carefully about integrity and significance. She said that it is typical of the type of building in this neighborhood at this period of time. It looks and reads as it did and you can see three storefronts that were intended for three small businesses. He said the alley is almost a third façade. She supported designation on Criterion D for style, period.

Ms. Vyhnanek supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. She noted the idea of prominence within the neighborhood and said it is intrinsically tied to the neighborhood. She said the building has been there from 1920 until now and that you know where you are in the neighborhood. She noted the neighborhood's deep roots in laborers. She recalled a statement made by another board member at the nomination meeting that these buildings are monuments for those who don't have statues. She said the building has three facades that are prominent and unusual.

Mr. Murdock supported designation. Regarding Criterion D he said the building has integrity and can convey its significance; he said there is nothing in the language that mentions needing to be exceptional to be designated. Regarding Criterion C he noted the corner business has always been a café or restaurant and Mama's; he said there are enough cultural memories as a meeting place for union members, artists, neighbors for nearly 100 years.

There was board agreement that interiors would not be included and criteria D and F were appropriate.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Mama's Mexican Kitchen Building at 2234 Second Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards D and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/MSN/RK 6:0:0 Motion carried.

011817.3 CONTROLS AND INCENTIVES

011817.31 Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store
400 Westlake Avenue

Ms. Sodt explained the request for a four-month extension.

Jack McCullough concurred.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Firestone Auto Supply & Service Store, 400 Westlake Avenue until the second meeting in May 2017.

MM/SC/RK/MSN 6:0:0 Motion carried.

011817.4 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator