



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 201/25

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Hybrid Meeting via Webex Webinar or Room L2-80 Boards & Commissions

Seattle City Hall, 600 4th Avenue, Floor L2

Wednesday, June 18, 2025 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Taber Caton (TC)
Roi Chang Vice-Chair (RC)
Matt Inpanbutr (MI)
Ian Macleod, Chair (IM)
Lora-Ellen McKinney (LEM)
Becca Pheasant-Reis (BP)
Harriet Wasserman (HW)

Board Members Absent

Dean Barnes (DB)
Katie Randall (KR)
Lauren Miles (LM)
Lawrence Norman (LN)

Staff Present

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty

Key

BM Board Member
AP Applicant
SM Staff Member

Chair Ian Macleod called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

061825.1 ROLL CALL

061825.2 PUBLIC COMMENT

No in-person public comment. Written comments were sent to the Board prior to the meeting.

061825.3 MEETING MINUTES

June 4, 2025

MM/SC/MI/BP

6:0:1

Minutes approved. BM Caton abstained.

061825.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

061825.41 Burwell House

709 14th Avenue E

SM Doherty gave an overview of the agreement, and reminded the Board that this was a recent designation.

Action: Motion to approve the Controls & Incentives agreement for the Burwell House at 709 14th Avenue E.

MM/SC/BP/HW

7:0:0

Agreement approved unanimously.

061825.42 Baker-Linen Building

Administered by The Historic Preservation Program
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

1101 E Pike Street

SM Sodt gave an overview of the agreement.

Action: Motion to approve the Controls & Incentives agreement for the Baker-Linen Building at 1101 E Pike Street.

MM/SC/TC/HW

7:0:0

Agreement approved unanimously.

061825.43 5th Avenue Court

2132 5th Avenue

Request for extension

SM Sodt gave an overview with a request for a 4-month extension.

Action: Motion to approve a 4-month extension to the negotiation of Controls & Incentives for 5th Avenue Court at 1101 E Pike Street.

MM/SC/LEM/MI

7:0:0

Motion approved unanimously.

061825.5 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

061825.51 former Wilsonian Apartments / Yugo Seattle

4710 University Way NE

Retroactive proposal for courtyard fence and gate

Saretta Tillmaand, OTAK explained the previous fence, and the fence and gate that was installed to address security concerns. They did not realize there was a required approval by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

The Architectural Review Committee feedback was primarily about the concern of it being submitted retroactively.

BM McKinney said it was a smart solution for the student housing property, and it does not detract from the landmarked building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a retroactive Certificate of Approval for the fence at the Wilsonian Apartments, 4710 University Way NE, 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 the Report on Designation, LPB 402/05.
 - a. The proposed fence changes the appearance of the courtyard but does not obscure views of the building.
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's goal is to improve security. No alternatives were requested, as the proposal seemed reasonable.
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:

Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the 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/LEM/TC

7:0:0

Motion approved unanimously.

061825.52 former Wilsonian Apartments / Yugo Seattle

4710 University Way NE

Proposed signage on courtyard fence and building

SM Doherty said the applicant is changing their proposal in response to feedback from the Architectural Review Committee. This item will be reviewed administratively and has been removed from the agenda.

061825.53 Georgetown Steam Plant

6605 13th Avenue S

Proposed accessible ramp at entry; retroactive proposal for new exterior scaffolding exit stair; retroactive alterations to interior stair handrails and guardrails; and retroactive alterations to Ash Room oil pipe, select areas of floor, and overhead brick at select boiler

BM Inpanbutr recused himself and moved to the audience.

Applicant Sam Farrazaino, Georgetown Steam Plant Community Development Authority described the retroactive application related to alterations for safety and access. He explained that he misunderstood that these reversible alterations would require a Certificate of Approval. Provided a detailed overview of each item accompanied by photographs of the changes, and some while in process.

BM McKinney asked for clarification on ADA access, and what happens on the inside, Is there a bump on the interior that a wheelchair would need to go over? Applicant clarified that there was no bump and that there is open floor space once you cross the threshold.

Vice-Chair Chang asked if they will be building a temporary ceiling below the ash hopper before the building rehabilitation. The applicant said that it is not the current plan. Removing the loose brick should be sufficient. Although they will engage a structural engineer to confirm that, as requested by Seattle City Light.

BM McKinney asked about the yellow bricks. The applicant said they will retain them on site and use them as part of future interpretation in the building.

The Board members noted that the methodologies were sound and reversible, but wished they had sought the require approvals in advance of doing the work.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the building alterations at the Georgetown Steam Plant, 6605 13th Avenue S, 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 111884.
 - a. The added ramp and stair have a minimal connections at the building exterior, and although the stair visually obscures features of the building, it is an interim egress solution, not a permanent one.
 - b. The stair handrail and guardrail alterations are easily reversible and the materials are consistent with the industrial character of the building interior.
 - c. The alterations to the oil pipe and select areas of the floor are to improve pedestrian access to portions of the interior and are easily reversible.
 - d. The removal of portions of overhead masonry is a necessary interim safety measure, not a permanent one. The masonry will be preserved on site, to be reinstalled as part of future rehabilitation/restoration work.
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. No alternatives were requested, as the proposals seemed reasonable.
3. With regard to SMC 25.12.750 C, the extent to which the proposed alteration or significant change may be necessary to meet the requirements of any other law, statute, regulation, code or ordinance.
 - a. The proposed changes to the handrails and guardrails, and the necessity for a ramp and exit stair are to address code requirements.
4. The factors of SMC 25.12.750 D and E are not applicable.
5. The proposed work as presented is consistent with the following Secretary of The Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as listed below:

Standard #9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the 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/LEM/TC

6:0:1

Motion approved. BM Inpanbutr recused.

061825.6 BRIEFING

061825.61 Shannon & Wilson Office Building
 3652-3670 Woodland Park Avenue N
 Briefing on proposed exterior alterations for entire perimeter

Applicant representative Ellen Mirro, Studio TJP introduced the project. Applicant Chad Lorentz from Urbal Architecture walked the Board through the presentation with an overview of how the project has evolved, and down to the details related to the proposed openings in the historic concrete block screen.

BM Wasserman said the applicant has been responsive to Board feedback and is moving in the right direction.

BM Pheasant-Reis agreed that they have been responsive to the Board feedback and have revised the proposal to be more in line with what the Board is looking for.

Chair Macleod agreed that what they are seeing today is in line with what the Board has been pushing for. The proposal preserves more of the character-defining features, specifically the historic concrete block screen.

BM Caton said looking at existing vs. proposed is helpful, but also looking at what has been previously altered – makes sense to alter what has already been altered.

BM Inpanbutr agreed that the project is trending in the right direction. Still troubled by removal of the block wall at the north. Nomination discusses the block wall as integral to the design –with the roof floating above it like a cloud. Wondering if the program for the café space can change to respond to the existing openings in that wall.

Vice-Chair Chang was also concerned about the large proposed opening in the block wall at the café, and asked if it was really necessary.

BM Caton agreed that the block wall issue was problematic and asked if it could be shifted over to preserve more length of the uninterrupted wall.

The applicant showed a sketch of how that might work, and some Board members agreed it was an improvement. BM Inpanbutr confirmed that they would not support new openings in the block wall.

There was a discussion of the steel details at the openings in the block walls, including looking back to a detail the ARC had shown a preference for. The wide flange beams were noted as too heavy in appearance and would like to see a different method.

Overall, the Board agreed that the proposed alterations to the south and east facades were less of a concern.

061825.7 BOARD BUSINESS