



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 10/23

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, January 4, 2023 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Matt Inpanbutr

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

Marc Schmitt

Padraic Slattery

Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Acting Chair Kristen Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

## ROLL CALL

### 010423.1

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Mariela Cordero, Franklin High School student and the school's Earth Corps President asked the board for support of the proposed garden project. She said the project would allow students to enjoy gardening while learning.

Deb Barker, community member and former Landmarks Board member had difficulty joining the meeting to give her public comment. She asked Ms. Doherty to convey to the board her noted urgency of upcoming Council Bill 120312.

**010423.2 MEETING MINUTES**

October 19, 2022

MM/SC/MI/DB 7:0:4 Minutes approved. Dr. McKinney, Ms. Chang, Messrs. Macleod and Schmitt abstained.

November 2, 2022

MM/SC/LE/MI 8:0:3 Minutes approved. Mmes. Caton, Johnson, and Wasserman abstained.

**010423.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

010423.31 Franklin High School  
3103 S Mount Baker Boulevard  
Proposed site alterations

Colleen Weinstein, Seattle Public Schools (SPS) explained the Earth Corps program and proposed establishment of two raised garden beds/boxes on the south lawn. She said students from the wood shop would build the boxes and are working with the garden club. She said they will start with two boxes and see how it goes. If successful, they may allocate space for two – four more boxes.

Mr. Barnes asked what kind of garden they plan.

Ms. Weinstein said food production but no trees or shrubs, just annual crops. She said produce would be distributed within the school and club community.

Mr. Barnes said there are a lot of gardens and foodbanks along Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard and asked if the club plans to work with any of those.

Ms. Weinstein said it is a school site and resources need to be used within the school.

Dr. McKinney said students do not necessarily eat well and that school lunchroom food is many times not healthy or fresh. She wondered if there was a plan or program that the produce could show up in school lunches etc. She said that has been done elsewhere.

Ms. Weinstein said it is a good point and students are actively growing and producing food which is good for all. She said the school's meals have been improved and encouraged board members to visit the SPS website.

Mr. Macleod asked if the gardens would be enclosed in the future.

Ms. Weinstein said no but that in the winter they may utilize hoop houses to protect crops, depending on what is being grown.

Ms. Wasserman said ARC reviewed the project and agreed it was a good thing to do; and it is easily removable in the future if needed.

Mr. Macleod thanked the students and appreciated their involvement in the process. He said it is a fantastic project and a great resource to the school and neighborhood.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the landscape changes at Franklin High School, 3013 S Mount Baker Boulevard, 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 the Report on Designation (LPB 102/16)*.
  - a. The proposed raised planters are small when compared to the scale of the school, and are in a location that do not adversely impact the building exterior or site.
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:

*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/LE/DB            9:0:2    Motion carried. Ms. Caton and Mr. Inpanbutr abstained.

#### 010423.4            **CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

010423.41            Beacon Hill Garden House / Turner-Koepf House  
2336 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue S  
Request for extension

Ms. Doherty requested an extension to February 15, 2023. She said the agreement is complete, but there is a 15-day notice to interested parties.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Beacon Hill Garden / Turner-Koepf House, 2336 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue S until February 15, 2023.

MM/SC/RC/MI 11:0:0 Motion carried.

**010423.5 BRIEFING**

010423.51 Pioneer Sand and Gravel Company Building  
901 Harrison Street  
Briefing on proposed development

Presentation materials in DON file.

Peter Krech shared the overall strategy for the site and provided context. He noted the landmarked features of the two-story cast in place concrete building and said they intent to successfully maintain the building's presence in the neighborhood. He provided an overview of the existing and new ground plane and noted the transition between old and new structures including stepping the building back and the inclusion of recesses or alcoves at all building entries. He said these enhancements are paired with right of way improvements along Harrison and 9<sup>th</sup> avenues and improvements to the right of way. He said improvements add curb bulbs, street trees and landscaping on both frontages. He said distinguishing features of the landmark include the board formed concrete structure, uniquely shaped window openings and steel sash windows and a decorative cornice. He proposed preservation of three façades and said a parti-wall would be removed and the original volume would be retained.

He said a window survey was conducted to evaluate condition and acknowledged that the windows are a fundamental character giving aspect of the building. The survey found them to be in disrepair to the point where salvaging them is not feasible. The design team proposes the windows be replaced in-kind with a similar product from Hope's Windows that replicate the appearance of the existing units. He said it is in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Standards (SOI). In addition to the proposed window upgrades other improvements include: full cleaning and sealing of the board form concrete; reconfiguring the north façade to allow sidewalk entries from Harrison Street in two locations; and returning the previously modified west façade to its original condition and including a door to the south addition and addition of canopies to north entries; reconstruction of the north façade and cornice at level 2 in addition to new windows that match those at level 1; reconstruction of the roof and inclusion of guardrail and planter to allow for an occupied terrace and reconfiguration of the southwest corner of Level 2 to allow for occupied exterior space where new and existing buildings meet.

He said at the southwest corner all tower columns have been recessed into the building. He said alley façade modifications include repair and cleaning of the concrete, reconstruction of the cornice, steel sash window replacement and infill of non-original window openings at Level 2. He noted fire department connections below the eastern most window. Where required mechanical services have been

held away from the corner to preserve the integrity of the landmark as viewed from Harrison Street.

He proposed modifying existing window bay to allow for an upgrade entry. The entry is recessed into an alcove allowing for grade transitions; the decorative detailing of the window is retained.

Mr. Krech said modifications at mid-block are proposed to permit entry into interior retail space including lowering the sill of the windows and reassessing the façade to accommodate grade transitions. He said the distinctive shape of the window head is retained and a canopy added for scale and weather performance. He said the lower sills at the mid-block entry on Harrison would enhance safety. He proposed improvements to the west façade including façade reconditioning, reconstruction and replacement of previously altered openings with new windows to match those elsewhere on the project.

He said the south, a portion of the return wall would be removed and reconstructed to match the existing concrete façade with inclusion of updated windows to match those on the west façade. He said the reconstruction further reinforces the volume of the existing building and this portion of the building is above the area of excavation and subterranean parking garage. He ensured that the new wall would blend harmoniously with the landmark. He said the team believes the preservation and enhancement decision maintain the integrity of the existing building while positioning it for integration with the new structure and showing both deference to its stepped form while emphasizing its important role in anchoring the corner and modulating the scale of the streetscape. He said they believe the work is in keeping with SOI.

Mr. Krech said exterior colors and finishes have been coordinated between landmark and new structure to ensure a harmonious relationship. He said the palette of the new tower extends the color theme with dark framing and clear glazing at the adjacent retail on 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue transitioning to lighter more reflective glass and metal in the curtain wall above. He noted the material transition between old and new demonstrating the design strategy to reinforce the integrity of the landmark through a simplified palette that will serve as a tailored backdrop to the more vibrant retail uses at ground floor.

Ms. Chang asked if the core of the landmarked building is being demolished and if so, why.

Mr. Krech said there is not enough room on site to get the four levels parking onsite with the landmark's existing footprint. He said additions altered the south façade over time.

Mr. Macleod asked if the parking couldn't have been pushed back.

Mr. Krech said parking code require compliant ratio commensurate with life science buildings.

Ms. Chang asked about removed window on the north face.

Mr. Krech said the original condition is of a recessed entry; it was later infilled with windows. He said the entire footprint would be removed and excavated so retaining that façade is not feasible with that approach. He said there is some precedent.

Ms. Chang asked if the issue is with excavation and noted she didn't see anything in the briefing packet. She said it would be helpful to see side by side comparison of existing north elevation with proposed north elevation design.

Mr. Slattery said it is a world-class project and that he supported it.

Mr. Schmitt asked for summary of ARC discussion.

Ms. Johnson said the ARC has seen the project a couple times. She said the project started with proposed new construction adjacent to the property and how much the new should overhang existing. She said there were specific discussions about details. She said the level of mezzanine with first floor is very complicated. She said it is unusual because it is concrete and paint it is easier to justify rebuild and build back in a way that mimics what was there before as it is easier.

Mr. Macleod asked about details on how to interface mezzanine with deck with windows.

Ms. Sodt said the applicant proposed an option for mezzanine window opening with no sash; board and applicant landed on putting a window sash in opening as it is more in keeping with SOI 9. She said there was some discussion about a new door opening and canopies. She said board had issues with the rail on roof deck. She said this proposal resolves some of the concerns raised at ARC. She said concrete finish discussion was prompted from previous briefings.

Mr. Schmitt said he was happy that concrete would return to bare concrete.

Mr. Krech said older photos show concrete painted; it has changed color over the years. He said natural concrete is the best way to finish.

Ms. Caton said it would be helpful to see proposed overlaid with existing and rebuilt for a clearer comparison.

Mr. Krech said he would do that.

*Mr. Norman left at 4:30pm.*

Mr. Macleod expressed concern with the point of connection between new and old buildings. He said the articulation especially at the top is not clearly differentiated as clearly as it could be. He said it is not clear how much material has to be removed and asked if it is possible to reduce that requirement through a waiver. It is troubling that even though the interior is not designated, to remove parts of existing building to serve a new building. She asked why it would be a given. She said new windows are a fantastic choice. She noted the structural honesty of restoring building to original concrete. She appreciated inclusion of lighting plan.

Mr. Macleod wanted to hear more about the parking garage.

Mr. Krech said it is what is permitted in the neighborhood.

Mr. Barnes appreciated ARC member comments. He said so much original fabric would be lost by all this. He said the architecture looks like it will fit into South Lake Union construction where much original architecture is lost. He said there is no old school look left. He said he wished more could be done.

Ms. Johnson said there is a tension between maintaining small building when zoning allows much larger. She said there is a sense of retaining the mass and volume of original building and the new has a strong cornice roofline. She said there is a loss of original material, but the original building is still legible.

Dr. McKinney preferred that the new would have elements of the original building style, so it is not applied onto original. She said it doesn't have to happen. She said it is harder and more expensive to do. She said where something emerges out of the old that is modern but retains elements of the old. She said it is heartbreaking that one can't find any of the city left. She said she would not support the project.

Mr. Macleod said he would not support the project at the current stage. He said he likes the new addition on its own and he appreciated the programmatic integration between the two buildings. He said they are 'there' yet in terms of differentiation especially at street level. He said Capitol Hill has a mix of buildings and there is interplay with and differentiation of new and old. He said he is not feeling that here – it feels like a continuous wall at street level, and he wants to see more articulation.

Mr. Krech said the view provided flattens the experience and said there is a wide recess between the new and old. He said the wall location is canted inwards to allow sightlines to landmark.

Ms. Sodt suggested applicant provide a view and noted the board has had a lot of conversation with previous Certificate of Approval; it would be helpful to have that perspective.

Mr. Macleod asked the function of the indentation.

Mr. Krech said it is a retail entry which is large enough to use as a patio; it is about 150 square feet.

Mr. Macleod said he likes programmatic element but the articulation between the two doesn't fully differentiate. He said the happy medium has not been found yet.

Mr. Inpanbutr disclosed he was involved with the building's window survey, and he would recuse himself.

**010423.6 BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Johnson spoke about Historic Seattle's letter to the Landmarks Board regarding the Council Bill. She provided an overview of the landmarked Seattle First National Bank and the subsequent controls and incentives processes that resulted in a signed Controls and Incentives document. She noted the proposed revisions to the council bill would remove controls from the landmark. She asked board members' position on what action (if any) should be taken. She expressed concern about precedent setting and that it might make sense for the Landmarks Board to provide comment. She said it is a strange precedent and she suggested writing a letter to City Council.

Mr. Barnes asked what is unique about this landmark.

Ms. Caton asked if board approved the controls agreement.

Ms. Sodt explained the landmark property. She said there was a long negotiation period with the owner who signed the Controls & Incentives Agreement. She said the Landmarks Board recommended approval and it was forwarded to the City Council, per the normal procedure.

Mr. Macleod asked if there was development pressure.

Ms. Sodt said not that she was aware of.

Ms. Wasserman noted public comments that the site should be used for housing and said the Landmarks Board does not consider use. She noted all the discussion by Council about use, when they should look at the TDP and incentive options.

Ms. Sodt said the Council's review was delayed until next week. The property owner signed the agreement and wanted to have the designating ordinance in place so they could sell TDP and get that incentive.

Mr. Barnes asked what Council thinks.

Ms. Wasserman said that clearly everyone was talking about a future use.

Mr. Macleod said it is unprecedented that City Council would override the Landmarks Board's decision. He noted the board is a panel of experts that the City Council is overriding.



Mr. Barnes said the Landmarks Board is limited in their role and purview, and cannot consider use.

Ms. Wasserman said a councilmember commented that the building is ugly and should not have been landmarked. She said the council is newer and has no understanding of the process.

Mr. Slattery said he loves the building.

Ms. Sodt said there are no standards or criteria for the City Council to follow if they decide not take the Landmarks Board's recommendation when a property owner has signed the Controls & Incentives agreement. It is unprecedented. In the past it only happened once, when the City had a signed a Controls & Incentives Agreement for the whole Monorail system, and the City Council decided to just place controls on the Monorail cars. There is an appeal process for an owner who doesn't agree to the Controls and Incentives, and it is clear. It flows up through the Hearing Examiner and then to City Council with criteria. The ordinance does not contemplate this current scenario and it hasn't happened before. Alterations are addressed through the Certificate of Approval application process. Changes made to accommodate use or expansion doesn't preclude housing. She said there are many instances where zoning incentives have been used to add housing to designated landmarks. She said the idea that housing and preservation do not work together is not true and the two don't need to be in conflict. She noted that all of the Landmarks Preservation Board appointments are recommended by the Mayor, and the Board members are experts that have been confirmed by the City Council through a public process, per the ordinance.

Ms. Caton said it is a great opportunity to educate the newer Council members who may not understand.

Mr. Barnes agreed and said it is a reminder of the process that the Board goes through; that it is not arbitrary. He said the owner signed off on the Controls and Incentives.

Mr. Macleod said the bigger issue is the City Council overriding the Landmarks Preservation Board process. He said the criteria and standards are not arbitrary and it is important to highlight the procedure.

Ms. Caton said there had been no issues raised about use.

Ms. Wasserman said they were talking more about use of the whole property as in knocking the building down. Like when the Board has considered some nominations of the elementary schools, and hear sad comments about how the school doesn't serve the kid's needs, and the Board should let them take it down rather than landmark it. She said the board isn't supposed to consider the future use of the property, only the potential significance of the existing buildings or site. She said the board is pretty bound by that, and the council needs to know that. She said the

things that were mentioned just a few minutes ago that the board doesn't preclude use for housing, there's all sorts of other uses. The City Council needs to know that there is a Certificate of Approval process for alterations. Maybe they do know, but she didn't think people understood that you can ask to develop housing without destroying the landmark.

Mr. Barnes said the thing that bothered him the most was that people said it shouldn't have been a landmark to begin with and it should be demolished. There are some landmarked buildings that are turned into housing, or some other alternative uses from the original intent of the building.

Ms. Chang said there are so many places that are repurposed, and consideration of use is not supposed to be part of the Board's decision-making. She said the board has always been able to assure building owners that even if it is just a single-story building in a zoning that allows multi-story, it can still be used, expanded. She said she agreed with other board member comments, that if the need for housing is the main reason that the Council members have decided to block it as of now, the Landmarks Board should point out clearly why that isn't a true argument. She expressed concern about precedent-setting.

Ms. Johnson said there is a process before the Controls and Incentives document is signed. An owner can take steps before signing the document – the particulars of the building in this case are very strange because the Controls and Incentives Agreement was signed by owner. She said it seems like for whatever reason a Council member prefers something else. She said the precedent is worrisome. She suggested as a Board or individually educating the Council on the process, how decisions are made and how new uses are accommodated through the Certificate of Approval process.

Mr. Inpanbutr said he supported writing a letter. He said he read the Historic Seattle post and found it very informative and recommended all Board members read it.

Mr. Schmitt concurred. He asked if there are restrictions on Board members commenting.

Ms. Sodt said an individual can represent themselves but cannot speak on behalf of the whole Board. She said Ms. Johnson as the Chair can facilitate writing a letter from the Board. She said it sounds like Board members want to send a reminder of what the procedures are, what board purview is, the standards used, and that there is no board purview over use. She said the board can write the letter together but must be careful about having emails going back and forth between board members so that the board is following the Open Public Meetings Act. She said that she and Ms. Doherty can help Ms. Johnson facilitate that exchange amongst board members so there isn't a rolling quorum. She said it sounds like the Board's focus is on education of the Council on the Landmarks Board's procedures and process, and how there have been successful Historic Preservation and Housing joint projects. She said that Board members can speak individually to Councilmembers and can

reach out to district councilmembers, but can't speak on behalf of the full Board when doing so. She said they can identify themselves as Landmarks Board members, but to be clear that they are speaking as an individual.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the guidance. He noted that Board members are volunteers. He said he reads every letter of comment that comes in, and that there were a few that seem to take umbrage with the Board members as if they are high and mighty, or have some sort of vested interest beyond doing community service. He said that perhaps they need a gentle reminder. He said the Landmarks Board is doing this work as volunteers, and out of a love for preservation, rather than being paid to, or having some other agenda.

Mr. Barnes concurred.

Ms. Johnson said she would start a letter with what has been discussed and would send it to the staff.