The City of Seattle
Landmarks Preservation Board
Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

**LPB 364/25**

**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, November 19, 2025 – 3:30 p.m.**

Board Members Present
VJ Kopacki (VK)
Ian Macleod, Chair (IM)
Lawrence Norman (LN)
Becca Pheasant (BP)
Katie Randall (KR)
Erica Thomas (ET)
Harriet Wasserman (HW)
Cameron Wong (CW)

Board Members Absent
Taber Caton (CT)
Roi Chang (RC)
Lora Ellen McKinney (LEM)

Staff Present
Sarah Sodt (SD)
Erin Doherty (ED)
Nelson Pesigan (NP)

Key
BM Board Member
AP Applicant
SM Staff Member

Chair Ian Macleod called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

**111925.1 ROLL CALL**

**111925.2 PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no public comments.

**111925.3 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

111925.31 Coca Cola Bottling Plant Building
1313 E Columbia Street
Proposed select window replacement

AP Jim Cary of Cardinal Architecture, and Steve De Bruhl from Seattle University, presented a proposal to replace two original windows and one non-original garage door on the east side of the former Coca-Cola building, and explained that the precedent for this request stems from the 2008 renovation project, when windows on the north and east sides were replaced to support the conversion of the building into offices and shop space.

The current proposal continues that effort, focusing on the shop area and newly conditioned staff break room. The existing windows are steel-framed with a mix of translucent and opaque glass, which limits visibility and risks condensation. The replacements will match previously installed FCO 590X thermally broken aluminum storefront windows, ensuring consistency in appearance while providing insulated, operable awnings better suited for their programmatic use.

Regarding the garage door, AP Cary noted that the existing oversized door is uninsulated, causing temperature control issues during summer months. The proposed replacement will replicate the current door's appearance but incorporate insulation to improve energy efficiency and comfort. Supporting materials included site plans, elevations, historic photos of the building, and product cut sheets.

AP Cary emphasized that the new windows and door will align with the building's established design, maintain its historic character, and enhance functionality for university staff.

BM Katie Randall asked why, for the sake of consistency along the building's frontage, the proposal does not include replacement of all windows, given the importance of retaining as much original historic fabric as possible.

AP Cary explained that replacing the additional windows is not programmatically required at this time and would be costly, and noted that in 2010 a similar process was undertaken to replace a few windows on the north side that were outside the original renovation scope and as the building's use continues to evolve, window replacements are being addressed gradually on a piecemeal basis.

BM Randall asked to confirm if there were some window replacements referenced in the presentation occurred after the property has been designated as a landmark.

AP Cary confirmed that there were window replacements that had happened after the building was designated.

BM VJ Kopacki asked for clarification on whether the ongoing plan for window replacements is to proceed as needed—based on building use, occupant needs, or the nature of the structure over time—or as funding allows when changes become necessary.

AP Cary confirmed that the following comments and clarifications are correct.

Chairperson Macleod asked how well the two substantially different styles of windows match in terms of materials and appearance.

AP Kerry confirmed that the windows match, noting they are the same system with identical style, operable features, and steel detailing and explained that the only difference is proportion, as the office portion of the building originally had slightly larger windows compared to the warehouse section.

SM Erin Doherty clarified that the proposal involves aluminum windows replacing steel windows using an EFCO product, similar to the 2009–2010 project, and noted the intent is to match window proportions and operations as closely as possible, using a one-for-one approach—metal to metal.

BM Randall expressed support for the proposal, noting the thoughtful approach of replacing only materials that are necessary while maintaining functionality and keeping the building in service and stated the project appears to meet requirements and indicated is happy to support it.

BM Harriet Wasserman expressed no concerns with the plan, commending the thoughtful approach to maintaining the historic building and thanked Chair Macleod for raising the question about window consistency and noted the project is being handled carefully as an ongoing effort, offering her support.

BM Kopacki agreed with other board members, noting the proposal is straightforward and consistent with work previously approved for the building around 2010 and expressed full support for the project.

Chairperson Macleod noted that the windows are simple in design and easy to replicate, adding that the project will look good and that board members appear to agree.

Action:

I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed select window replacement at the former Coca Cola Bottling Plant, 1313 E Columbia Street, 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 123294.

   a. The existing windows are original and part of the character defining features. However, the proposed replacement window operation, muntin configuration, scale and profiles will be similar to the original sashes and will be located in the same plane as the existing windows within the original masonry openings.

   b. The proposed windows are consistent with a previous window system utilized in the building, that was approved by the Landmarks Board circa 2010.

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 is seeking new windows with an insulated glass assembly for improved thermal performance and clear vision glass, to benefit the staff that use this space.

3. The factors of SMC 25.12.750 C, D and E are not applicable.

MM/SC/KR/VK
7:0:0
The motion passed and approved unanimously.

111925.32 Gatewood Elementary School
4320 SW Myrtle Street
Briefing on proposed window replacement

AP Marc Tegan presented a proposal for the selective replacement of deteriorated wood windows at Gatewood Elementary School (built 1920, landmarked 1988).

*BM Becca Pheasant arrived at 3:00 p.m.*

AP Marc Tegen from Stemper AC presented the briefing. The project aims to improve energy efficiency, comfort, safety, and emergency egress by removing original wood windows and installing new aluminum-clad units, while maintaining historic context. AP Tegen reviewed the building's renovation history (1922 Naramore addition, 1990 removal and refurbishment) and noted that many original decorative features and windows had been altered or relocated over time.

The current proposal continues this careful, incremental approach, replacing only those windows that are unsafe or inoperable.

BM Randall asked for clarification on the proposal, noting that the briefing packet did not specify which windows would be fully replaced versus refurbished. BM Randall understood this omission to be intentional, as the

project team is still determining which windows will require full replacement and which may be candidates for refurbishment.

AP Tegen explained that the school district's priority is to replace classroom windows first, focusing on those identified in the condition assessment as most in need and noted that while some windows, do not require refurbishment, there is a concern about consistency—for example, whether it makes sense to retain a single maintained window on the south elevation when all others require replacement.

AP Tegen added that certain areas on the north elevation, including childcare spaces, stairwells, and offices, could benefit from refurbishment, while third-floor hallways would be the lowest priority.

BM Becca Pheasant requested more information on how window damage was assessed, noting that some conditions labeled as extreme—such as complete paint failure—are typically considered standard deterioration and repairable by restoration professionals.

BM Pheasant questioned the criteria used in the survey, who conducted it, and how the categories were defined, particularly regarding what percentage of a window must be replaced to be considered a complete failure.

AP Tegen explained that the condition assessment, prepared with Miles Stemper, aimed to provide detailed information on window status and clarified that paint failure alone was not considered a reason for window failure; rather, the key issue is significant wood deterioration.

AP Tegen described how extensive rot—such as being able to push a putty knife through the wood or at least a quarter inch deep—indicates damage beyond repair, requiring replacement of the affected piece. In such cases, repainting or sanding would not suffice, and dutchman repairs would be necessary.

BM Pheasant referenced a recent wood window restoration workshop where professionals discussed repairing large sections of windows with putty.

BM Pheasant asked whether AP Tegen has direct experience in wood window restoration and what background informs his assessment of repair versus replacement methods.

AP Tegen acknowledged he is not a wood restoration expert but has experience with historic wood preservation projects, including using epoxy for severely rotted areas and explained that putty can be effective for small repairs, typically a quarter inch or less, to smooth surfaces and restore profiles.

However, he cautioned that putty alone is not reliable for significant deterioration, even with high-performance products containing wood fibers, as a proper substrate is required for lasting repair.

AP Stemper, collaborating with AP Tegen, noted that repairing many of the windows would require extensive disassembly and reassembly, often off site, which adds significant cost. Even with advanced putty or epoxy, such repairs are complex.

AP Stemper emphasized that newer windows also provide performance advantages, which both the architects and the school district are considering in their evaluation.

BM Kopacki asked what alternatives exist if no work is done on windows labeled as failing, such as whether they would be boarded up and also inquired about the selection process for the companies proposed to perform the work,

including Colby and Loewen, and requested information on their background and experience with historic preservation.

AP Tegen explained that Kolbe and Loewen were selected for their aluminum-clad windows, which closely match the historic profile and offer high quality with an expected service life exceeding 20 years. He noted that these companies have strong track records, unlike past experiences with other manufacturers such as Pella.

Addressing the condition of failing windows, AP Tegen stated that attic windows marked in red are already boarded up, and most on the south elevation are inoperable due to severe rot. Only one window remains technically operable but unsafe to use, and similar deterioration is expected in lower windows, except in the principal's office.

BM Thomas sought clarification, asking whether it was the two attic windows that had been completely boarded up with no access to open them and with the handles removed.

AP Tegen confirmed that the two attic windows on the south and north elevation.

BM Randall asked whether refurbished windows could achieve the same level of functionality as full replacements, given that many existing windows are currently inoperable.

AP Tegen explained that refurbished windows would likely have fixed-in-place upper sashes, limiting operability and noted that functionality involves both operability and thermal performance, and refurbished units would not achieve the same thermal efficiency as new windows and referenced classroom nine on the second floor of the south elevation as an example.

BM Thomas asked whether there have been any incidents where children have pulled or broken window handles or caused windows to come loose by pushing on them, resulting in safety concerns.

AP Tegen noted that work orders do not specify whether children were involved in window handle issues, but confirmed that handle replacements have been widespread, particularly on the south elevation.

BM Randall sought clarification on the term "selective replacement," asking whether it refers to replacing only certain elements of the windows rather than just specific windows by condition and noted that most windows appear to be proposed for replacement of the glazing, surround, and frame.

AP Tegen clarified that selective replacement refers to replacing the full wood window frame and operable sashes, focusing primarily on those marked red and orange, and possibly some yellow-coded windows.

AP Tegen noted that certain yellow-coded windows might be candidates for refurbishment, but the school district's priority is classroom windows to improve thermal comfort, reduce noise, and ensure safety and security through operable units.

SM Doherty emphasized that the main purpose of the discussion is to determine whether the board is generally supportive of aluminum-clad window replacements and to gather any additional feedback or questions..

Chairperson Macleod thanked SM Doherty's clarification and asked if there were specific questions the board could address to help AP Tegen move forward and noted that the core issue appears to center on window material selection and other major project details.

BM Randall expressed support for an approach that prioritizes retaining functional windows where occupants are satisfied, such as in the principal's office, while also weighing historic functionality against modern performance standards and emphasized the importance of preserving double functionality as part of the historic window experience but acknowledged the challenges of refurbishment in achieving comparable performance.

Given the condition of many windows, BM Randall stated she would support replacement of those in the most serious condition and added that a final proposal should clearly outline, window by window, which elements are to be refurbished and which are to be replaced, noting that this level of detail is still being developed.

BM Wasserman commended the thorough window survey work completed so far and emphasized the importance of balancing school functionality with preservation and noted that the board will want clearer information on priorities and the overall plan, particularly regarding which windows are most in need of replacement.

BM Wasserman appreciated the presenters' selective approach, including the possibility of refurbishing some yellow-coded windows rather than replacing all, and stressed the need for upfront clarity on what partial replacement entails and expressed interest in seeing these details in the next project phase.

BM Kopacki noted the information from Kolbe regarding their ability to match the original window profile exactly, rather than just closely and stated that it would be helpful to see confirmation of this capability as part of the project details.

Chair Macleod agreed with prior remarks, stating that full replacement appears to be the most practical option and emphasized the importance of matching the profiles and proportions of the existing windows, particularly given challenging conditions around the terracotta.

Chair Macleod noted it would be helpful to see detailed drawings of how the window assemblies fit into the sills. While acknowledging one window may still be in decent shape and concluded that overall replacement seems justified.

BM Pheasant expressed and believed the red-coded windows could be repairable and would have preferred to see investigation into options such as double-glazed retrofits or other energy upgrades that might avoid full replacement.

BM Pheasant noted disappointment that a window restoration specialist was not consulted, suggesting this created an assumption that replacement was the only solution. While acknowledging replacement now seems likely and appreciated the effort to retain trim details where possible.

**111925.4 BOARD BUSINESS**

There was no board business.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm