



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 563/18

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

600 4th Avenue

L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room

Wednesday October 3, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Deb Barker

Russell Coney

Kathleen Durham

Rich Freitas

Alan Guo

Garrett Hodgins

Jordon Kiel

Kristen Johnson

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Manish Chalana

Steven Treffers

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

100318.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 5, 2018

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

100318.2 SPECIAL TAX VALUATION

100318.21 Pacific Architect & Builder Building

1945 Yale Place East

Ms. Doherty explained the submitted rehabilitation and eligible costs were \$1,321,985.37; percentage Value of Rehabilitation was 181%. Work for designated portions of the property were performed in conformance with a Certificate of Approval issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board. Exhibits included photos. She said work included interior demolition, new finishes, seismic footings and shear walls, subgrade utility work, painting.

Ms. Barker asked for clarification of site.

Ms. Doherty said the site is designated but does not include the lot to the west.

Mr. Kiel appreciated they were able to take advantage of the Special Tax Incentive program.

Ms. Barker said it was a soft touch.

Action: I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve the following property for Special Tax Valuation: Pacific Architect & Builder Building, 1945 Yale Place East, that this action is based upon criteria set forth in Title 84 RCW Chapter 449; that this property has been substantially improved in the 24-month period prior to application; and that the recommendation is conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Landmarks Preservation Board and the owner.

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

100318.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

100318.31 Harvard Belmont
803 E Prospect St
Proposed landscaping and street trees

Jay Magruder proposed updating the garden which, he said, is an accumulation of revisions, changes between 1950s – 1980s. He said they will save the small patio off the southeast and the plinth but everything else there is new. He said they opened up the garden, took out dead and diseased vegetation. He said they will plant a hedge on top of the wall in existing planting beds.

Mr. Freitas said the committee met and reviewed the work on site. He said all vegetation had been removed except for a portion of Yew hedge which has a wild character to it; it is 6 – 8’ high and will be maintained.

Mr. Magruder said they will replace it with a new Yew hedge instead. He said that hedge could not be cut down to 5 feet.

Mr. Freitas said the Yew is dense but easily trainable; it grows to 8’ which is too tall. He said they recommended it will be maintained no higher than 4’.

Mr. Magruder said the photo shows the string line across; the hedge will provide privacy but won't hide features of the house. The brick wall is 4 – 6" lower on inside of wall.

Mr. Coney arrived at 3:45 pm.

Ms. Nashem said the owner provided a letter agreeing to maintain the hedge at 5'.

Mr. Magruder said the 5' measurement from the top of the wall is not perfect, he said when he measured the datum the review committee discussed, it was 5 feet.

Ms. Nashem noted that Paperbark Maple street trees are common along Harvard; the existing Popular will remain on Prospect.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for replacement of landscaping and planting new street trees.

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

District Ordinance

The proposed landscaping plans as presented October 3, 2018 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the district as specified in SMC 25.22. The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

I. STATEMENT OF INTENT AND PURPOSE

The Development and Design Review Guidelines identify the unique values of the district and are consistent with the purposes of the district and other criteria of SMC 25.22 which created the Landmark District. The guidelines identify design characteristics which have either a positive or negative effect upon the unique values of the district and specify design related considerations which will be allowed, encouraged, limited or excluded from the District when Certificate of Approval applications are reviewed.

Within the District, a Certificate of Approval, issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board, is required prior to the issuance of any city building, demolition, street use, or other permits for proposed work which work is within or visible from a public street, alley or way, and, which involves:

C. The addition or removal of major landscape and site elements, such as retaining walls, gateways, trees or driveways.

In addition, for proposed removal or addition of significant landscape and site elements for which permits are not required, and which are identified specifically in the district Development and Design Review Guidelines, a Certificate of Approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board shall also be required prior to the initiation of the proposed work.

2. CRITERIA AND VALUES

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.

3. GUIDELINES

B. SETTING

1. General

Guideline: New development in the District should not obstruct existing views. The ultimate height of new trees and other landscaping should be considered so that they do not become so dense that views are blocked.

2. The Block

Guideline: Maintain yard space, especially that of front and side yards visible from the street. Front yards should not be used for parking areas. Protect or add trees and landscaping to help reinforce yard edges.

3. Landscaping:

Guideline: Maintain existing landscaping, especially the mature trees.

Guideline: Maintain the alignment and spacing of street trees. Planting street trees where none now exist is encouraged.

Guideline: Keep the space between sidewalk and street as a green planting space maintaining the same width wherever possible. Ground covers may be used in place of grass. Do not use crushed rock, concrete or similar materials as the major surface material.

Guideline: Privacy of existing properties should be preserved.

MM/SC/RF/DB 7:0:1 Mr. Coney abstained.

100318.32

Harvard Belmont

706 Belmont Ave E

Proposed installation of wireless communications facility

Gibran Hosniak explained the existing pole will be removed and replace with a taller one. He said a canister antenna, equipment enclosure, AC power, side mount conduit will be installed. The equipment is place high to discourage tagging; it can be accessed by ladder or lift. He said there will be no vault and the fiber will come from overhead. He said Seattle City Light will place the pole, AT&T will obtain overhead permits, and right of way and use are obtained through SDOT. He said the

equipment will be painted Sherman Williams Fairfax Brown, to match pole color. Dimensions of equipment are provided on drawings.

Ms. Barker asked if another carrier could share use of the pole.

Mr. Hosniak said it is unlikely; there is not adequate room and there are separation requirements between carrier antennas.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Coney asked if the pole will be wood.

Mr. Hosniak said it yes. He said it is just under 5' taller than the existing pole and meets the minimum clearance requirement. He said a master agreement is in place with SCL.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board issue a Certificate of Approval for installation of a wireless communication facility.

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

District Ordinance

The proposed landscaping plans as presented October 3, 2018 do not adversely affect the special features or characteristics of the district as specified in SMC 25.22. The other factors of SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable

The Harvard Belmont District Guidelines

I. STATEMENT OF INTENT AND PURPOSE

The Development and Design Review Guidelines identify the unique values of the district and are consistent with the purposes of the district and other criteria of SMC 25.22 which created the Landmark District. The guidelines identify design characteristics which have either a positive or negative effect upon the unique values of the district and specify design related considerations which will be allowed, encouraged, limited or excluded from the District when Certificate of Approval applications are reviewed.

Within the District, a Certificate of Approval, issued by the Landmarks Preservation Board, is required prior to the issuance of any city building, demolition, street use, or other permits for proposed work which work is within or visible from a public street, alley or way, and, which involves:

A. The demolition of, or exterior alterations or additions to, any building or structure;
Purpose and Goals

The purpose and goals of the Harvard-Belmont District are:

C. To stabilize or improve the historic authenticity, economic vitality, and aesthetic value of the district;

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

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.

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

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

100318.33

Chamber of Commerce Building

215 Columbia Street

Proposed security gate

Ms. Sodt provided photo of façade and explained the application to put in a security gate at two of the arched openings. She said the storefront is inset and all arches are new. She said that two segments of gate / fencing will block entry for classroom which is used one – two times per week. ARC was supportive but thought the gate should be straight across rather than arched.

Ms. Barker said when the gates are open they stay out of the way; the width of the gate matches the depth of the niche.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Deliberation:

Mr. Kiel said ARC found it reasonable and it doesn't impact historic materials.

Mr. Coney supported straight of arched gate.

Mr. Freitas asked about material.

Ms. Sodt said it matches storefront system; a sample was provided.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed security gate, at the Chamber of Commerce Building, 215 Columbia Street.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Ordinance No. 123848 as the proposed work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and is 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/GH/KJ 8:0:0 Motion carried.

100318.4 PRESENTATION

100318.41 “Beyond Integrity: Equity in Historic Preservation in Seattle”
By 4Culture Staff and the Beyond Integrity Working Group

Brandi Link and Dana Phelan, 4Culture, provided an overview of research done.

Ms. Link said the Beyond Integrity Working Group has been looking at equity and historic preservation, who and what gets left out and why. She said that marginalized groups and immigrants are left out, as are modest and ordinary buildings, and places that have seen changes. They looked at how to shift focus, so these places are preserved. She said that “I love this place because ___” posters were used at community events and responses indicated the importance of vernacular architecture. She said they are looking at whether methods are changing to meet goals. They are gathering data on equity, engaging decision makers, and working to foster stronger voices especially of underrepresented and marginalized groups.

Ms. Phelan said interns have gathered data and done analysis related to equity. They looked at the number, type, and distribution of historic properties in King County which derive significance from underrepresented communities, the number of historic properties associated with underrepresented communities and which have and have not been nominated/designated. She said they looked at the city landmarking process from 2008 – 2015, meeting minutes. Architectural significance was emphasized above cultural significance. She noted significant buildings that have been nominated – Liberty Bank, Colman School, and those that have not yet been, including Black Panther associations. She said they reviewed the process and considerations the Landmarks Board had in looking at properties.

She said there is a role for Beyond Integrity and 4Culture engagement with the board. She said they will foster a strong voice for the public, support nominations of underrepresented communities, offer technical support and grant writing. She noted the need to revise, supplement designation report to include social and cultural associations. She said they have more information to add to Colman School file.

Ms. Phelan said it is important to make the invisible, visible. She said community engagement projects, outreach tools, and finding ways to preserve intangible history are some of the ways identified. She noted Shelf Life, a local oral history project.

Mr. Coney noted the struggle and lamented the loss of the Republican Street Cottages. He appreciated the research and noted that the board members are volunteers.

Ms. Johnson said there are limits on the board and noted the way nominations come to board are varied. She said it was exciting that the West Seattle community brought forth a couple nominations but she said that often the board doesn’t know who the buildings are important to.

Mr. Kiel said that the board doesn’t govern use, and use patterns are linked to that. He questioned how a building could convey that.

Ms. Barker said there is a lot that could be rewritten. She noted how she felt when some projects didn't have support of the board or community. She noted the value of neighbors showing up and telling stories as opposed to just sending a letter. She said so often attorneys are pointing out everything that is wrong and noted that the people who were once there are now gone. She said stories are important. She said the applicant approach is challenging, some want designation, others don't; and it is often tied to financial issues the board cannot consider at that time.

Ms. Durham said often underrepresented communities can't get to meetings or may not understand the process. She noted importance of community and advocacy groups. She said vernacular architecture is important and goes away so quickly. She reiterated that the board members are volunteers.

Mr. Hodgins said it is hard to quantify and the board can't tell a group what is important.

Mr. Kiel said it depends on the board makeup.

Ms. Durham said for some, a landmark is a burden on their community. It is tricky especially if it is a community we are not part of.

Mr. Freitas said to have the tools – such as neighborhood and other context studies – would be helpful. He said public comment could be organized in a way that can be presented to the board. He said nominator doesn't suggest criteria.

Mr. Coney said they frequently tell us why it is not meeting the criteria.

Mr. Kiel said that the role of research can be a barrier but community speaks volumes.

Ms. Johnson said it is usually the same handful of historians representing the nominators; the board should be open to a different style.

Ms. Barker said it could be captured in a narrower format.

Mr. Kiel said digging deeper a layer could be added to report. Some may say it is hard to find information on underrepresented communities – their stories are not mentioned in newspapers.

Ms. Link said they are trying to mine the data for more information on underrepresented communities.

Mr. Hodgins said it is more of an issue now, it wasn't mentioned at all in 1980s.

Mr. Link said nomination forms have changed and more information is required now.

Ms. Doherty said the content and documentation has grown so the documents are larger now.

Mr. Hodgins said not asking or mentioning something could skew data.

Ms. Phelan said lots of underrepresented communities are not mentioned. She said they are looking at properties that could be supplemented.

Ms. Doherty said they can always add information to a landmark file.

Ms. Link said it is important to include additional information to file and they will be doing that, she noted Colman School.

Mr. Coney noted for the Sheridan Apartments the landlord was historically a woman and the residents were women; at the Canoe House women were left out. He said hopefully the trend is going in the right direction.

Claudia Kiyama said they can start with low hanging fruit. She said going forward the board can frame their review with ‘is an underrepresented community involved?’ ‘is it part of the story?’ She noted a tendency to go to architectural focus rather than history. She said the board can ask questions about underrepresented communities.

Ms. Barker noted the printing building that had great stories connected to an underrepresented community.

Ms. Johnson left at 5:05 pm.

Mr. Freitas said they look at integrity, significance and what conveys that.

Mr. Durham said often the story is more important than the building elements etc., community advocates need to help the board understand so they can justify that.

Ms. Kiyama commented that the more modest buildings are invisible and are seen as being of lesser value. She said the community’s voice is important.

Mr. Hodgins said 4Culture weighing-in on nominations and designations would be helpful.

Mr. Kiel said the Belltown community is a great model; they have done a great job and identify criteria in their comments.

Kristen Whitters said that Liberty Bank was a compelling story that was particular to the entire country. She noted the challenge of underrepresented communities’ ability to tell their story and history which is US history and history of the country. She said they are not including everyone and to make sure we are looking at everyone’s history not just one neighborhood’s history.

Ms. Kiyama said she has been working on Latino heritage survey and she is having a hard time reaching the community; they have been told ‘no’ so many times. She noted the history of rejection makes it harder to engage or be invested in process.

Jeff Murdock said he is haunted by his Liberty Bank decision while he was on the Landmarks Board. He said a designation can be made on Criterion C or F alone – the Ordinance doesn’t parse this. He said the Hahn Building, gateway to the Market should have been designated but that he remembers the presenter showing the

percentage of building fabric that had been changed. The ‘double significance’ of C is not true; it is just written in an odd way.

Mr. Kiel said he voted against the nomination in Cascadia that had turned into something unrecognizable. He said not every building is a landmark and a filter to parse is needed. There needs to be a bar of significance, but it needs to be truly significant to community rather than just one tenant there for a few years.

Mr. Murdock said Liberty Bank had significance and that argument doesn’t make sense. He said it baffles him that it wasn’t designated.

Ms. Durham said sometimes we lose them because there aren’t enough people; voting for designation is based on majority of members on the board, not just those in attendance at meeting.

Ms. Barker said it just happened recently.

Mr. Coney asked if the Ordinance could be changed or if there could be proxy votes.

Holly Taylor noted the absence of definition of integrity in Ordinance and how to interpret it. She noted the integrity of the relationship.

Mr. Freitas said it would be interesting to hear about how minutes reflect how integrity informed decisions.

Ms. Kiyama said it doesn’t have to convey to *me*, it is more important to community, significant community. It is about what is important to the people at the site and in the community.

Ms. Doherty said the staff does ask these questions of the applicant. She noted the challenge that some history is not as easy for the applicants to find and tell. She noted the value of having more thematic context statements available to the public.

Ms. Sodt said it is important to fund this type of work.

Mr. Kiel said the city’s housing need is put in conflict with landmarking and said that affordable housing can be in existing housing/buildings.

100318.5 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator