



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 113/23

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, April 5, 2023 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Matt Inpanbutr

Ian Macleod

Becca Pheasant-Reis

Marc Schmitt

Padraic Slattery

Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

Acting Chair Roi Chang called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

## ROLL CALL

### 040523.1

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Tom Heuser spoke in support of the nomination of 1550 E. Olive and asked the board to look past the plywood and graffiti. He noted the detailed craftsmanship – decorative urns, cornice, brackets, spiral detail, leaded windows, marble bulkhead and said it is rare for a building this size. He said the building served as a place of

refuge for the WTO protesters and has defined its intersection for 100 years. He agreed with Historic Seattle's comments about nominating the eastern retail space alone.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle spoke in support of the nomination of 1550 E Olive Way. He also said he appreciates efforts to reduce the footprint of the Bressi Garage addition and said what has been proposed is a tall second story and not a penthouse. He said it is over interstitial space. He said what is proposed does not meet Secretary of Interiors Standard 9 or NPS Technical Brief 36. He said rooftop additions are not appropriate for single story buildings and that many single-story buildings have been successfully adaptively reused without additions or rooftop decks.

**040523.2 MEETING MINUTES**

February 15, 2023

MM/SC/DB/HW

7:0:2 Minutes approved as amended. Ms. Pheasant-Reis and Mr. Inpanbutr abstained.

**040523.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

040523.31 Seattle Center House / Armory

305 Harrison Street

Proposed exterior building lighting

Matt Aalfs, BuildingWork explained the lighting supports the functions of the building and helps it to serve as a welcoming public center. He went over lighting concept and materials and proposed to illuminate the façade with roof-mounted fixtures, uplighting at vertical relief areas and provide feature lighting of signage and eagle figures on the north façade. He said the proposed lighting is part of a larger, phased project; Phase 2 has been completed and involved smaller scale canopies, and new entry doors.

Oliver Littleton, Dark Light Design proposed uplighting on four façades drawing attention to window relief and downlighting via roof-mounted fixtures. He said lighting on the south façade would cast light down the wall, on north façade lighting would highlight the eagles. On east and west façades roof-mounted flood lights would cast light evenly down the building and have a lower visual impact; flood lights would be 16' apart. New banner light fixtures would call attention to banner only. That lighting is white only, no color changing.

Mr. Macleod asked if treatment is planned for lantern like fittings on north side.

Mr. Aalfs said there are no plans for the stepped concrete elements.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked how conduit would get to roof-mounted fixtures.

Mr. Littleton said it would be roof-mounted and concealed.

Elise Novak, BuildingWork said the conduit would be on top of steel arms and would run in a flat cable past the roofline. There are junction boxes at roof locations.

Mr. Littleton said there are waterproof connectors on roof that are out of view.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if other strategies were considered for sign lighting.

Mr. Aalfs said the letters are steel lettering in a minimalist graphic approach.

Mr. Littleton said the protection of the façade is the first priority; what is proposed is the most effective method.

Ms. Wasserman said the applicant was responsive to ARC comments and has done a careful job that is appropriate as possible.

Mr. Macleod supported the application.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the exterior building lighting at the Seattle Center House / Armory, 305 Harrison Street, as per the attached submittal.

#### EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 123298.*
  - a. The proposed physical changes to the building exterior are minor.
2. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 B, C, D and E are not applicable.
3. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

*Standard #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.*

MM/SC/IM/DB            9:0:0    Motion carried.

040523.32    Bressi Garage  
226 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue N

Proposed building exterior/interior alterations, and penthouse addition

Presentation documents in DON file.

Andrew Kesel , Generator Studio provided context of the site and neighborhood. He noted the designated features of the building – walls (including windows), roof, wood trusses and interior timber roof decking. He said this is the fifth presentation to ARC / board and he shared preferred massing concept to add second floor and patio to the historic building. He went over material and color palettes and said lots of glazing is designed into the addition. He said the historic building will be re-roofed; the timber will still be visible inside. Plywood will be added as insulation and then the membrane on top will match. He proposed horizontal corrugated metal powdercoated in matte finish to provide visual separation between existing and new construction. He proposed clerestory windows to break up the south façade of addition. He proposed closing up door on the east façade and on the west façade changing existing opening to a storefront system. He said masonry at the west corner would be in a darker color. He provided rendering of northeast corner massing showing patio, wood cladding, and he noted that existing murals on east doors would be left.

Mr. Kesel said a person-door on the north elevation would be changed to a storefront and an overhead door would be changed to a storefront system as well to maintain the same cadence as previously altered openings. He said on the east side there is a lot of block infill; he proposed removal of block in middle three bays. He proposed reuse of the possibly original sliding door on the inside. He said on the south elevation flashing would be removed and an opening cut in to accommodate parking, drop offs and deliveries. He said that the historic truss and timber ceiling would have holes filled with laminated timber material. He said the patio would be set back for a nice shadow line. He provided a section cut showing the tunnel underneath the building and explained why the second floor is designed as tall as it is. He said the interstitial space is needed to run sprinklers mechanical, electrical, plumbing through.

Mr. Kesel explained that some truss ends are not in good shape and provided structural details on how to mitigate it. He said timbers and strapping would be added and shear tabs to create a column around the trusses. There would be a braced frame to support the second floor. He provided renderings of interior monitors which he said would be supported by beam clamps.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary said it is an exciting project and she was impressed by the interior volume of the historic building.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked how the mechanical in the interstitial space would penetrate through roof to primary ground floor space.

Mr. Kesel said there would be about 20 penetrations for the sprinklers but none for the ducts.

Ms. Chang asked about the depth of the interstitial space.

Mr. Kesel said it is very small, especially at the north end and noted they can't load the tunnel at all.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis noted how the height of the parapet looks from street view and that the roof does angle up toward streets. She asked about discussion of thickness of band above the windows.

Mr. Kesel said they worked backwards from the minimum height inside and noted the need to slope for drainage.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked about exterior lighting plans.

Mr. Kesel said there won't be much but noted the non-historic lights on the existing façade would be replaced with modern fixtures. Table lamps would be used on the patio.

Ms. Doherty noted that signage is not part of this application and would come later.

Ms. Chang appreciated the amount of feedback the team has taken in from ARC about scale of the addition. She appreciated the photos, 3-D rendering, and setback which gives the addition a smaller appearance. She said in the north view the walls appear shorter and it was helpful to see the north elevation would not be as visible because of the trees.

Mr. Macleod said the mass and scale in the east façade rendering works well on the north-east view. He said it would be nice if the roof deck were lower. He said this version works well and the massing is fine. He noted a mixed reception with the parapet/south exterior wall.

Ms. Clawson said the wall is massive and they are exploring what can be done to break it down.

Ms. Doherty said that she recalls the existing design came from changes requested by SDCI Design Review.

Mr. Kesel said it was Design Review who wanted more windows; the Landmarks board wanted scale broken down.

Mr. Macleod said he has the same concerns about visual massing. He said the clerestory windows are a nice detail. He said what is proposed is a nice addition. He asked if the north side trees are protected.

Mr. Kesel said they are legacy trees and will remain. They are in the right-of-way and not on the designated site.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis suggested limiting the number of penetrations through timber roof decking.

Mr. Kesel said they have culled it down. He said the sprinklers could be placed below roof level, but the piping would be visible.

Mr. Inpanbutr said a few pipes and ducts are no problem as it is an industrial-looking space and supported limiting penetrations.

Ms. Doherty said she is happy to work with the design team to look at that and she could review it administratively.

Ms. Caton agreed the timber roof decking should be kept as intact as possible and the exposed pipes were just fine.

Ms. Wasserman agreed and supported administrative review.

Ms. Chang agreed and noted penetrations should be limited while possible, a future change of tenant might want to add more.

Mr. Macleod agreed.

Mr. Barnes asked if penetrations had already been designed.

Ms. Doherty said there are no numbers now as the HVAC and sprinkler systems are not fully designed. She said she could work with team to review the future work and mitigate penetrations. The Board could condition their approval to require that.

Mr. Barnes said that makes sense.

Ms. Wasserman supported the team working with Ms. Doherty on design and administrative review.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis noted support.

Ms. Doherty said she would mark that on the drawing set.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed alterations and addition at the Bressi Garage, 226 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue N, as per the attached submittal.

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 125643.*

- a. The addition changes the massing of the building, but the setbacks on the north and west sides help mitigate its impact.
  - b. The necessary added height of the penthouse is influenced by the historic building's curved roof form, accommodating mechanical ductwork above the roof to be less impactful to the historic timber trusses and decking, and to allow the depth of new structure that will span the below-grade tunnel.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, *the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.*
- a. The proposed addition is significantly less impactful than a full floorplate penthouse, or a multi-storied addition.
3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D and E are not applicable.
4. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

*Standard #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.*

*Standard #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/MS/DB            9:0:0    Motion carried.

040523.33

Montlake Elementary School

2409 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue E

Proposed building exterior and site rehabilitation, and 3-story addition

Ms. Caton and Mr. Inpanbutr recused themselves.

Erica Ceder, DLR Group provided context of the site and neighborhood. She noted three briefings were done for ARC and one for the full Board on this project. She provided a summary of the school's history and noted the building was built in 1924 and designed by Floyd Naramore. She said the original design is modest and noted two separate entries, one for girls, one for boys. The historic building is set on a small parcel and sits upon a plinth which is not ADA compliant. She explained the design for the new addition would sink down so the second floor of the addition would align with the first floor of the existing building. She said additions were designed around retaining as much exterior play area as possible. She proposed demolition of non-designated elements: seven portables, cafeteria, and

greenhouse; as well as some designated elements: covered play areas and mechanical plant at the rear of the building.

Kelly Mabry, DLR Group presented an aerial of the site and indicated proposed additions noting the lighter glazed portion connecting to the historic building. She said new entry would be added to the northeast side of the site and would provide accessibility. She said there would be minimal visual impact to the historic east façade. She said a landscaped area at historic entrance would become outdoor learning area. She noted the gym at the southwest side and south side play court and access ramp to all levels.

Martina Wirtl, Osborn Consulting identified trees to be removed and noted they would be replaced with similar species such as Hawthorne, Maple, Linden. She proposed 18 new trees. She went over the proposed landscape plan and said the historic railings would be cleaned and recoated; she noted double swing gates similar to historic rail would be installed at the north and south entry stairs.

Ms. Mabry said they want to maximize the outdoor space so propose the penthouse on top of the classroom wing. A penthouse would house mechanical, air, water, heat pump system, and elevator. Alternative locations were studied but programmatically this location was most efficient. She proposed to maximize efficiency of duct runs.

Ms. Ceder went over demolition plans noting the demolition of one-story structure and reduction of the historic chimney to 8' above roof. She said a window survey was done; existing single-glazed wood windows show deterioration and operating sashes would be replaced with new. Historic brick removed would be retained for reuse. She said the existing color palette would remain the same – red brick, white trim for window frames and sashes, putty color for cast stone elements. The new addition would be differentiated with a darker blend of brick and in pedestrian areas, a lighter color brick.

Ms. Ceder said the cast stone elements at the historic entry would be cleaned, significantly deteriorated units replaced, cracks and spalls repaired, a standing seam copper cap at the top of projecting cornice piece added to help shed water and coated with breathable protective coating. She said operable windows in typical classroom would be replaced with wood sash replica, vertical grain Douglas Fir stiles, rails and muntins to match existing profiles and sizes. She said glass panels to be true divided lite with muntin bars that fully separate the individual panes of glass. New glass is to be ½" insulated glass unit.

Ms. Ceder proposed security cameras and exterior lighting and noted functional needs were balanced with aesthetic concerns related to the historic building architecture. A similar lighting fixture has been used at other historic schools within the district. She explained a request to include an electronic reader board sign on the northeast corner of the site. The sign is to inform the school and larger community of events and notices. Operating hours for the sign would be limited to



7:00 am – 9:00 pm. She said it gives the ability to message in multiple languages. The sign will be for text only and no video or moving images.

Ms. Chang asked if there was any deterioration at the plinth.

Ms. Ceder said they would know more once the contractor starts the work.

Mr. Macleod asked for more information about historic window restoration and replacement.

Ms. Ceder said they would remove operable sash portions, do frame restoration with a little alteration to profile of glass stops to accommodate thicker units.

Ms. Doherty said the masonry restoration and other elements are considered in-kind and she is reviewing it administratively.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis asked about designated classroom elements.

Ms. Doherty said classroom interiors are designated but are not part of this application.

Mr. Barnes appreciated the presentation and the plan to improve access. He asked how play areas are impacted, and if they plan to use the Montlake Community Center.

Ms. Ceder said they incorporated as much onsite play as possible by taking advantage of sloped site. Other community resources have been identified and noted the nearby Community Center.

Ms. Wasserman said it was a thorough presentation. She said with the tiny parcel the roof deck play area is needed. She said she didn't like the electronic sign but noted it won't flash. She supported the chimney reduction and lighting at entrance. She said the windows are being done right and the beautiful arched windows are being preserved.

Mr. Schmitt appreciated the utilization of the site and noted he loved the courtyard area.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the window restoration. He said it is a simple building in form and the windows are so much of what makes the building special. He supported keeping what we can of the chimney.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis appreciated what was proposed and noted it is respectful to the historic building. She noted it is a challenging job.

Ms. Chang concurred and said the site is small and challenging. She looks forward to seeing how the project turns out.

Mr. Macleod said he preferred the electronic sign not be there, but noted it would not be attached to historic structure, would not be color, and won't be on all hours. He thought it wouldn't be a major intrusion.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed exterior alterations and rehabilitation, select demolition, site/landscape alterations, and new building addition at Montlake Elementary School, 2409 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue E, as per the attached submittal.

### EXPLANATION AND FINDINGS

This action is based on the following:

1. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 A, *the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change would adversely affect the features or characteristics described in Ordinance 124778.*
  - a. While the proposal includes selective building demolition, the covered play areas and furnace room are less significant features at the rear of the building, and their removal will allow for the building rehabilitation and expansion.
  - b. While the proposed building additions on the north and west sides of the property are large, their location behind the historic building is subservient to its massing, and the aligned main roof level and setback penthouse of the north wing do not compete with the historic building form.
2. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 B, *the reasonableness or lack thereof of the proposed alterations or significant change in light of other alternatives available to achieve the objectives of the owner and the applicant.*
  - a. The applicant team presented informal design briefings to the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and Landmarks Board (Board) throughout the development of the project's design, and received positive feedback from the Board members present, including the following meetings:
    - 1) ARC – April 15, 2022
    - 2) Board – June 1, 2022
    - 3) ARC – September 30, 2022
    - 4) ARC – January 27, 2023
  - b. The applicant presented four massing options, including additions in different locations. All of the informal Board member feedback supported the current proposal because it offered the most spatial relief to the historic building.
3. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 E, *for Seattle School District property that is in use as a public school facility, educational specifications.*
  - a. The proposed additions are needed to accommodate the increased student population proposed for the property, and meet the criteria outlined in the Seattle Public Schools educational specifications.

4. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C and D are not applicable.
5. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below (or cite other applicable standards):

*Standard #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.*

*Standard #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/MS                      7:0:2    Motion carried. Ms. Caton and Mr. Inpanbutr recused themselves.

Mr. Inpanbutr left the meeting at 6pm.

**040523.4                      NOMINATION**

040523.41                      1550 E Olive Way

David Peterson, Historic Resources Associates prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided history and context of the building and neighborhood. He said the building was constructed in 1924 and designed by Lawton and Moldenhour. He said after Olive Way was extended from Bellevue Avenue to Broadway in 1922, developer Andrew Burns, Olive E. Way Improvement Company bought up parcels and constructed garages and retail buildings. The subject building has six storefronts on Olive and two on the side. Occupants over time included neighborhood services including hair salon, cleaners, florist, tailor, beverage stores. He noted that there have been various occupants and uses over time. He said the rear has always been a parking garage.

Mr. Peterson showed a photo of the south façade and noted it was covered in paint and graffiti. He pointed out the concrete foundation with heavy timber trusses in garage and commercial spaces at side of garage. He noted the wood sash windows and terracotta elements that tie the garage and retail together. He said the building is in poor shape and had been boarded up due to vandalism but noted decorative elements of wrapped terracotta, spiral trim, urns, turned wood posts. He said some storefronts are more intact than others. He said a hole was cut in the alley side for garage access. He said one storefront has basement, another was originally a ramp and another was associated with the garage and had stairs.

Mr. Peterson said the building looks the same aside from the graffiti and boarded up storefronts. He said garage entry was added to alley elevation and the skylights are

gone. He said the awning boxes and terracotta work are intact. He said that while none of the bays were completely intact, each has some original elements.

Mr. Peterson said the architectural firm George Lawton and Merman Moldenhour designed the building. Moldenhour was hired by the firm Lawton and Saunders initially as an office boy but he moved into a draftsman apprenticeship. Lawton and Saunders' business partnership lasted from 1898 until 1915. The firm's projects included apartments, hotels, department stores, schools, single family houses, institutional and religious buildings and utilitarian structures such as warehouses and mills. After the dissolution of the partnership Lawton established an independent practice and was assisted by Moldenhour who was listed as an associate architect in newspaper notices and in city directories. Projects attributed to them include the Woodland Court Apartments, the Franklin Apartments and the Castle Apartments. Moldenhour was made a partner in 1922 and the practice was renamed Lawton & Moldenhour. Projects attributed to this partnership included the Fifth Avenue, Olive Crest, Cascadia, and Hawthorne Square apartment buildings among other institutional and utilitarian buildings. Lawton died in 1928 at the age of 64. Moldenhour went into independent practice in the 1930s and 1940s and in the second half of the 1940s he served as supervising architect for the Port of Seattle's Sea-Tac Airport Administration Building.

Owner Comment:

Owner representative Stephen Lu said his parents bought the building in 1987 and personally managed the properties. He noted the challenges of vandalism and property destruction in the neighborhood. He said they are selling the property in consideration of his father's health and with the safety of the community in mind.

Charlie Bauman said a remnant of the history of the building is contamination beneath the building. 30 – 40% of the property is contaminated with petroleum and gas from its years as a garage.

Ms. Wasserman noted public comments about separating the storefronts from the building to save the trims and decorative elements. She wondered if there was any logic to keeping part. She said there are nice things on the building but she questioned the integrity of the underlying structure.

Mr. Peterson said the building is unreinforced masonry on concrete. He said he wasn't sure about the stability with excavating for contaminants.

Mr. Bauman said that anything can be done, but questioned if it should. He said the contamination goes to the property line under the building which impacts the cost and feasibility of remediation.

Mr. Slattery asked if there is a plan for the property.

Ms. Clawson said not at this time but they hope the building is not designated so they can address the issue.

Mr. Barnes noted there have been numerous changes but the decorative elements are there. He wondered about integrity.

Mr. Peterson said he was surprised how much is intact and noted the wood turned corner pieces, door surrounds, green marble, awning boxes. He said the terracotta ornament is there except for a few urns. He said elements are beat up but there is a lot under the plywood. He said the retail was just neighborhood shops and there garage has just been a garage. He didn't know about its seismic stability.

Ms. Wasserman said she was surprised so many storefronts are changed, yet still have window trim, and marble.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said the building has integrity but not enough to move on to other criteria. She said there is enough left to be considered but it doesn't specifically meet any designation criteria.

Mr. Schmitt said the building is beat up and did not meet the bar for nomination.

Ms. Caton asked if contamination is under retail portion.

Mr. Bauman said he didn't know the extent but that most of the contamination is where the retail wall meets the garage.

Mr. Macleod supported the nomination and said the building is an interesting departure. He said it is intriguing and he noted the marrying of the garage and small retail spaces. The green marble is a fantastic detail. He said it has a surprising amount of integrity for its typology and would meet Criterion C. He said the building is unique and has importance for the neighborhood. It embodies the auto row of Capitol Hill transitioning to the residential area. He said small storefront buildings are disappearing.

Mr. Slattery said it is an amazing building – the bones are there. He wasn't sure about how he would vote.

Mr. Barnes said the building has changed too much and the elements are not consistent throughout the building. He did not support nomination.

Ms. Wasserman said there is so much there it could easily be nominated but she was almost certain it would not be designated.

Ms. Caton said the building could be a contributing building in a district but not a landmark on its own.

Ms. Chang said it is surprising to see the intact details. She appreciated the report which document elements still there. She said the building embodies the

architectural style of the 1920s, but she said that too much has changed and the building could not stand as a landmark; it has style and embodies the period but does not rise to landmark status.

Mr. Schmitt asked staff how to think about the contamination.

Ms. Doherty said the Board's evaluation of the building should be based on the six designation standards, and if the property has the integrity or ability to convey that significance.

Mr. Slattery said he would not support nomination.

Mr. Macleod said the building meets Criterion D and while it is not iconic, it is part of Capitol Hill's fabric and embodies its character, as much of the character is changing to a dense canyon of high rises. He said precious few remain.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of 1550 E Olive Way as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not meet any of the designation standards, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

MM/SC/MS/DB            7:1:0    Motion carried. Mr. Macleod opposed.

**040523.5**

**BOARD BUSINESS**