



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

LPB 46/26

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, March 4, 2026 – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Roi Chang, Vice Chair, (RC)
VJ Kopacki (VJ)
Ian Macleod, Chair, (IM)
Lora Ellen McKinney (LEM)
Becca Pheasant (BC)
Erica Thomas (ET)
Harriet Wasserman (HW)
Matt Zinski (MZ)

Board Members Absent

Lawrence Norman (LN)
Katie Randall (KR)
Cameron Wong (CW)

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.

030426.1 ROLL CALL

030426.2 PUBLIC COMMENT

Colleen McAleer, President of the Laurelhurst Community Council, expressed strong support for granting Seattle Public Utilities an extension, noting the Council’s long-standing involvement since the site’s 2013 designation. Colleen praised the Board’s careful stewardship and stated that the community is pleased SPU has acquired the property.

Pat Chaney, Vice President of the Laurelhurst Community Council, voiced strong support for Colleen McAleer’s comments and thanked the Board for its continued commitment to preserving the Talari’s site now commonly referred to by neighbors as the Yesler Creek Preserve. Pat highlighted the community’s recent, encouraging discussions with Seattle Public Utilities and described the site as a once-in-a-generation opportunity to honor tribal history, support salmon recovery and watershed education, and showcase urban ecology and horticulture.

030426.3 MEETING MINUTES

January 21, 2026

MM/SC/BP/ET

7:0:1

The motion passed. BM Kopacki abstained.

February 4, 2026
MM/SC/BP/ET
8:0:0
The motion passed.

030426.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

030426.41 American Can Company Factory Building
2601 Elliott Avenue
Request for extension

SM Sarah Sodt reported that the requesting applicant has asked for a three-month extension and noted that she has already provided them with a draft for their review, and they are currently in the process of examining it.

MM/SC/LEM/BP
8:0:0
The motion passed and was approved unanimously.

030426.42 Sunset Hill Community Hall
3003 NW 66th Street
Request for extension

SM Erin Doherty met with representatives of the property earlier in the week to review a revised draft and discuss interior and site details and request an additional three-month extension is needed.

SM Doherty explained that the primary challenge has been determining how to address the building's interior. The current approach focuses on preserving the open volume of the main floor while not treating finishes, lighting, the stage, or other non-historic elements. This direction aligns with the preferences of the property owners, who are also the nominators.

MM/SC/VJ/ET
8:0:0
The motion passed and was approved unanimously.

030426.43 Battelle Memorial Institute/Talaris Conference Center
4000 NE 41st Street
Request for extension

SM Doherty explained that Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) is now the owner of the property, as the previous owner, 4000 Property LLC, no longer holds it and that no projects are currently under consideration and the only matter before the board is an extension of the negotiation period.

SM Doherty added that SPU will continue the negotiations from where they left off with the former owner. She recently visited the site with SPU representatives, who are preparing for significant cleanup and maintenance work.

Kevin Burrell, Senior Policy Advisor with Seattle Public Utilities, thanked representatives from the Laurelhurst Community Council for their supportive comments regarding the extension request and noted that board members may have questions about SPU's plans for the site and encouraged them to view the December 10 Seattle City Council briefing available on the Seattle Channel, which provides extensive background on the property acquisition and SPU's long-term intentions.

Kevin Burrell emphasized that the briefing offers a helpful overview of why SPU purchased the property and the direction of the project moving forward.

SM Doherty stated that SPU is requesting a six-month extension to allow time for site assessments, cleanup, and general maintenance activities.

MM/SC/MZ/VJ

7:0:1

The motion passed. Vice-chair Roi Chang informed the Board that she is recusing herself from the project and from any future discussion related to it.

030426.44 Lake Court Apartments
2012-2020 43rd Avenue E
Request for extension

SM Doherty reported that the property owners, who were not the nominators, are still reviewing the draft agreement previously provided and are requesting an additional six-month extension and noted that the owners are actively conducting repair and maintenance work, including addressing dry rot issues and undertaking expanded repairs as new conditions have been uncovered.

MM/SC/ET/HW

8:0:0

The motion passed and was approved unanimously.

030426.5 BRIEFING

030426.51 former Seattle Brewing & Malting Company
6010 Airport Way S
Briefing on proposed interior alterations at Office Building

BM Becca Pheasant informed the Board that she is recusing herself from the discussion.

Presenter David Curran of SHKS, presented the proposed interior tenant improvements for the landmark building. He reviewed the building's history, existing conditions, and the scope of work, noting that all proposed changes are limited to the interior and do not affect the exterior.

Presenter Curran described the historic features of the main hall, including its spatial volume, mezzanine, wood detailing, and arched windows, as well as non-historic elements such as mechanical ductwork and infilled skylights. The proposal includes constructing two office partitions in the northwest corner, replacing non-historic light fixtures with minimal pendant fixtures, removing abandoned radiators to reveal original finishes, eliminating a non-historic interior door, adding a small, cantilevered conference-room sign, and refinishing the existing wood floor.

Presenter Curran also summarized several design alternatives studied during the process, noting that the preferred scheme best balances functionality with preservation of the building's historic character.

SM Doherty explained that the item was presented as a briefing rather than a full application because she had not yet reviewed the complete packet and the ARC meeting had been canceled. She wanted the Board to have an opportunity to see the proposal in advance and raise any concerns or provide input on alternatives shown.

BM Zinski expressed support for the proposed floor refinishing, signage, and lighting replacement and noted reservations about the proposed office partitions, stating that while the finishes were acceptable, the change to the spatial volume of the main hall gave him pause, leaving him undecided. BM Zinski did not support removing the radiators or the interior door, commenting that the radiators contribute to the character of the space and that the door could remain in place without affecting functionality.

BM Kopacki agreed with many of BM Zinski's observations and requested additional information and asked for further detail on whether the radiators could be retained or incorporated into the design, as well as more information on the light-fixture options given the interior's controlled features and potential for light damage and also requested clarification on the methods proposed for refinishing the historic wood floor.

Vice-Chair Chang commented that retaining the radiators could be beneficial if they remain functional, as they contribute to the historic character of the interior, but she will not support keeping them if they pose safety concerns or cannot be restored. Vice-Chair Chang found the proposed office boxes acceptable given their removability, and noted that one alternative design with larger windows allowing views to the original exterior windows was particularly compelling and expressed no strong concerns regarding the lighting, the conference room door, or the proposed signage, and supported refinishing the wood floor, agreeing that additional technical information requested by other board members would be helpful.

BM Harriet Wasserman expressed strong support for refinishing the historic wood floor, noting its beauty and the value of preserving it and having no concerns about replacing the existing utilitarian light fixtures, stating that the proposed fixtures are appropriately unobtrusive. BM Wasserman found the office-partition design acceptable and appreciated the alternative option with glass, though she cautioned that occupants often cover glass for privacy and expressed some hesitation about removing the third interior door, noting that it represents a more permanent alteration to the building. Overall, BM Wasserman praised the project team's approach and was pleased to see the space being thoughtfully restored and reactivated.

BM Erica Thomas expressed strong appreciation for the plan to refinish rather than replace the historic wood floors and noted that she initially favored the office alternative featuring steel-framed windows but acknowledged concerns about privacy raised by other members. BM Thomas supports retaining the radiators for their aesthetic value if they do not require removal and agreed with other members' hesitation about eliminating the interior door, requesting additional explanation of the benefit of its removal. Overall, BM Thomas liked the proposed changes and the quality of the presentation.

Chair Ian Macleod expressed strong support for restoring the historic wood floor and commended the thoughtful selection of new light fixtures, noting that they appropriately echo the building's industrial character and supported the proposed signage, observing that it evokes the style of King Street Station in a fitting way. Chair Macleod commented that while he appreciated the creativity of the plywood and stacked-lumber office-partition alternatives, he felt they were not compatible as exterior finishes for the new office enclosures. However, he suggested that such contrasting treatments might be explored on the interior surfaces of the offices to clearly differentiate new construction from historic fabric.

Board members expressed strong support for refinishing the historic wood floor and general agreement that the proposed lighting and signage were appropriate and compatible with the building's character.

Several members raised concerns about removing the radiators and the interior door, noting their potential historic value and requesting additional information before considering approval. Members were divided on the proposed office partitions: while most found the approach acceptable, some questioned the impact on the spatial volume of the main hall and asked for further exploration of alternatives, including options that preserve views to historic windows.

Overall, the Board appreciated the quality of the presentation and requested additional details on specific elements, particularly the radiators, lighting options, and floor-refinishing methods.

The applicant will need to provide additional information about what work is proposed at the mezzanine to understand if it is visible from below, requiring review and approval as part of the C of A application.

030426.6 BOARD BUSINESS

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.