



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 151/15

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
Seattle Municipal Tower
700 5th Avenue, 40th Floor
Room 4060
Wednesday, March 4, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker
Nick Carter
Robert Ketcherside
Aaron Luoma
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair
Sarah Shadid
Matthew Sneddon
Mike Stanley

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Valerie Porter
Alison Walker Brems, Chair
Elaine Wine

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

030415.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 3, 2015

MM/SC/NC/MSN 6:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Shadid abstained.

Mr. Luoma arrived at 3:35pm.

030415.2 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

030415.21

First Avenue Group (Coleman Building)/Watermark Tower
1103 First Avenue
Proposed exterior alterations

Applicant Comment:

Mike Skidmore said the building had major remodel in the 1990s and the historic portion is the terracotta façade along 1st Avenue. He said there is no terracotta on Post Alley side.

Mr. Luoma arrived at 3:35 pm.

Mr. Skidmore said the three floors on the southwest corner are above grade and were modernized in the 1980s; the storefronts are not part of historic fabric. He said they propose to change out three of the store front windows and the existing store front entry door. He said that two banks of new aluminum clad wood sliding window will be installed. The upper window will change to vents. He said that entry door will be wood full light glass. He said that on the east elevation they will remove the existing aluminum storefront at the southwest and replace it with a sliding system aluminum clad window. He said the windows will be Jeldwen bronze on the exterior and walnut finish interior. He said the entry door will be walnut wood with clear glass. He said that at the pedestrian corner of 1st and Spring they will add relief air vents for the mechanical system to the windows. He said that Spring steps down; they will install a black 1 ½” diameter pipe 12’ from the glass to prevent falls out the window. He said the banding between the windows will be black fox. He said they will not touch the terracotta.

Ms. Barker said that ARC asked for clarification about the circle.

Mr. Skidmore said the bar shelves are lit and the circle is where they want to ghost the logo but it is not solidified yet.

Ms. Sodt said that they can come back if need be.

Mr. Sneddon asked what the original windows looked like.

Mr. Skidmore said there is no record of what was there originally.

Ms. Sodt said that the building is part of the First Avenue Group where multiple buildings are in one Ordinance; the tower was already permitted at the time. Responding to questions she reiterated that the only historic fabric remaining is the terracotta.

Mr. Stanley asked about continuing banding on the west.

Mr. Skidmore said it is three stories off the ground and they will keep the symmetry around the corner.

Mr. Murdock asked the banding color.

Mr. Skidmore said it will all be the same color. He said that they won't try to match finishes – the new bronze is a little bit darker – but will be as close as possible. Responding to questions he said that the drink rail will be behind the plane of the window but will be visible when the windows are open.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker said ARC was fine with the material bronzes. She said that what is proposed is a mish mash. She said she was okay with the transition on the east façade from the large window and door into new treatment. She said the south façade felt mish-mashed. She said the south window around bar is consistent with east.

Mr. Luoma said the operable windows don't align with transom above.

Ms. Barker said the south façade is a combination.

Ms. Sodt said they didn't talk about that; the symmetry was off.

Mr. Luoma said the windows are not historic; the historic windows were likely more symmetrical.

Mr. Ketcherside said if it were fixed it wouldn't make sense. He said there must have been symmetry – the vertical lines go top to bottom.

Mr. Sneddon said the movable window is drastic. He said that in the absence of historic material he was willing to accept the alteration of symmetry. He said if he is okay with movable window then he would be okay with lack of symmetry. He said the windows are already a mish mash.

Mr. Murdock said that the level of detail of the building as a whole was lost; the terracotta was preserved but that's it.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed exterior alterations to the Coleman Building (First Avenue Group) located at 94-96 Spring Street.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed exterior alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance # 111058, as the alterations 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/AL/NC 8:0:0 Motion carried.

030415.22 John B. Allen School – Brick Building / Phinney Neighborhood Ctr.
6532 Phinney Avenue North
Proposed alterations to site, exterior and interior for improved accessibility

Applicant Comment:

Kevin Kane, SHKS, explained the proposal to improve accessibility to the brick building and noted the other building has already been addressed. He said that most entry and access is from the parking lot side. He said the existing entry doors are below the parking lot level and have stairs. He said that the new elevator entry will be a primary entrance and lobby. He said that this location will have the least impact to the building and structure. He said that they will cut through the concrete floor structure. He said they proposed a landing, overhead canopy, and ramp on the west side of the building. He said they will salvage the existing historic window, and install new door and clerestory window in existing masonry opening; they will install concrete retaining walls for the ramp. He said they will use the same paver as they did at the other building. He said that they will use cast in place concrete walls for the planters; wood benches; and woven wire mesh guardrails. He said that black chain link fencing will separate play areas from the ramp. He said that all improvements are reversible.

David Curran went over the interior scope and said the ramp enters on to the main floor. He said the principal's office will become the new elevator lobby. Two classes on this floor will be impacted. He said to a create code compliant elevator entry they will need to move a wall; the classroom chalkboard will be salvaged and reinstalled on the other side at the elevator lobby. He said they will add sinks to the daycare / classroom. He said that the existing casework in the office will be removed and salvaged. He said they will open up the wall between the elevator lobby and hallway. He said they will do minimal work in the attic for the elevator control room. He said the elevator shaft will be painted blue; they will re-use existing light fixtures. He said they will add new track lighting in front of the relocated chalkboard.

Mr. Cain said that sconces will provide up and down light. He said a solar powered exterior lightpole is proposed at the foot of the ramp. He said that recessed LED lights will be in the ramp walls. He said that there is an

existing light at the existing entry door. He said that architectural grade galvanized finish is proposed for structural and canopy steel and rails. He said they propose a wood transom window and door to match others on the building. Responding to questions about exploration of alternatives he said that the addition of 30" high landing and ramp is less impact to the building than a ramp to the existing lower entry doors. He said the Dayton Avenue entry on the east is at grade but there is no parking available. He said that an external elevator would have more impacts to the building. He said what they have proposed is the only real logical location and the least impactful.

Mr. Stanley asked if the wall treatment will be the same.

Mr. Cain said the white cream paint color is similar to the existing lobby one. He said the protective rail will be left in place.

Ms. Doherty said that earlier proposals located at excavating ½ a level down in the parking area, and the elevator cab would have to be two-sided. She said there is no dedicated parking on the low side of the building.

Mr. Kane said the floor is cast-in-place polished concrete and they will match existing finishes. He said that the solar light pole will provide light at the foot of the ramp and identify a place of arrival.

Mr. Kane said that there is no parking lot lighting. He said that the Phinney Neighborhood Center is dedicated to sustainable practices and this solar lightpole will be the only one.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Ms. Barker went over ARC comments and said that the internal volume of the building would be interrupted by the creation of the new office in the hallway which is an area of control. She noted the chalkboard relocation was consistent with other schools and the ramping is new and sympathetic.

Mr. Sneddon said the building symmetry is vital to the original design and the ramp will upset that balance. He said that the new work is distinguishable from the historic, and he noted the code and safety and health requirements. He said that he wished there was an alternative.

Ms. Doherty said that the west side was historically the back of the building, and is now used more frequently because of its relationship to the parking lot (former play area).

Mr. Carter said that the proposal is the lowest impact to get the elevator in, and it is the back side of the building, although now use as the front. He said he had some reservation about the relocation of the office to the corridor.

Mr. Stanley said he appreciated the exploration and noted that the new is clearly differentiated from the old.

Mr. Ketcherside said that he would love to maintain the building's symmetry. He said the design is tasteful and differentiated from the rest, and one can still distinguish the original symmetry.

Mr. Luoma said there are some other existing walls in the corridor that create similar interruptions, and they can be removed in the future. He said the site and exterior improvements are well done and complementary and add to the site. He expressed concern about the mish mash of exterior spaces and wondered if there was a master plan.

Mr. Murdock agreed with Mr. Luoma and said it is an elegant solution that makes a stronger entry sequence. He said it is the back of the building.

Mr. Stanley said to not destroy the historic floor.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed site, and building exterior and interior alterations at the John B. Allen School - Brick Building, 6532 Phinney Avenue North, as per the attached submittal and conditioned that the materials for the hallway offices will not impact the floor.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed site, alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123845, as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
2. The building exterior and interior alterations affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 123845, as the proposed work removes historic materials that characterize the property. However, the proposal is intended to mitigate the overall impact to the building, and is intended to be done in general with compliance with Standard #s 9 & 10 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*
3. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/MST/DB 8:0:0 Motion carried.

Ms. Doherty cited Standard #10 and said that she will review details with applicant.

030415.3 NOMINATIONS

030415.31

Wiggen & Sons Funeral Home
2003 NW 57th Street

David Peterson, Nicholson Kovalchick Architects, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context and history of the area and its relation to the expansion of the Great Northern Railroad in the late 1800s. He reported that John Pheasant worked as an apprentice for Graham and Engeman. He later brought in Olaf Wiggen and together they purchased the business and renamed it Pheasant and Wiggen. Pheasant was active in the commercial development of Ballard. He was a member of the Loyal Order of Eagles and was instrumental in the construction of its Ballard headquarters. After Pheasant's death in 1938 Wiggen started his own mortuary firm down the street. Wiggen served in the 1937-39, and 1943 House of Representatives and was active in many local organizations. He died in 1951.

In 1945-1946, a block north of the former Mayfield Funeral Parlor location, Wiggen & Sons constructed the subject building to be their new facility. The architects were Elizabeth Ayer and Rolland Lamping, of the firm Edwin Ivey Inc. He said that Mahlum designed the addition in 1979. He said that Bonney Watson Funeral Homes purchased the business in 2000 and runs it now.

Mr. Peterson provided an overview of the funeral home business and noted they became more common in the mid-1800s with the use of embalming. He said that the first national meeting of undertakers was in 1882. He provided information about other early funeral homes in the Seattle area.

He said that this building has a large chapel space in the center, office, 'slumber rooms', flower and catering rooms, and an apartment for an on-site resident. He said the building was built up to the sidewalk edge and is now obscured by trees. He said the 1961 addition reads very differently from the original structure. He noted the undulating form of the projecting roof, and the canopy and wall addition. He said that the front entry location was retained.

Mr. Peterson said that the building did not meet any of the criteria for nomination.

Public Comment: Two letters were received and provided to the board.

Board Discussion:

With the exception of Mr. Murdock who supported nomination and Mr. Sneddon who recused himself, board members were not supportive of nomination.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Wiggen & Sons Funeral Home at 2003 NW 57th Street as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/NC/AL 6:1:1 Motion carried. Mr. Murdock opposed. Mr. Sneddon recused himself.

