



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 164/23

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, May 3, 2023 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Matt Inpanbutr

Ian Macleod

Lawrence Norman

Becca Pheasant-Reis

Marc Schmitt

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Padraic Slattery

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

ROLL CALL

050323.1 PUBLIC COMMENT

Pete Hanning, Fremont Chamber of Commerce noted the importance of Fremont history but said the Fremont building is not representative of Fremont and should not be nominated.

Deb Barker supported the nomination of the Fraternal Brotherhood building and noted the importance of recognizing the building. She supported nominating this building and was sad that some folks didn't get it. She said the building has housed so many character-forming businesses over the years and retains so much integrity. She said the building is important to the makeup and composition of Fremont. She said the building meets criteria C and F. She said it is not high-end big style but has been a place for real people to meet and be served.

Jeff Murdock, Historic Seattle supported nomination of the Fraternal Brotherhood Building. He said the building is significant to the neighborhood and has integrity to convey its significance. He said the building has many stories to tell about its commercial and social history. He said the masonry is intact and the original cornice is still there. He said door and window placement remain unchanged and the early storefront is in place. He said being a URM building does not impact its significance. He said it meets criteria C and D. Regarding the Leona Apartments, he said that he agreed with Queen Anne Historical Society position that replacement of lower row of windows with a horizontal mullion instead of the original curved profile would be detrimental to the building's integrity. He suggested the team seek incentives to maintain the integrity of the building.

David Peterson Historic Resource Consulting said it is work noting that the SHPO and DAHP determined the building to be eligible for National Register in March 2023 and noted criteria A and C as applicable. He said it is remarkable there is no Fremont historical district, and most people assume there is. He said it is remarkable the number of buildings intact there.

Ms. Doherty said letters of public comment received were forwarded to board members.

050323.2

MEETING MINUTES

March 15, 2023

MM/SC/DB/HW

8:0:1

Minutes approved. Ms. Pheasant-Reis abstained.

050323.3

CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

050323.31

Leona Apartments

916 Queen Anne Avenue N

Proposed replacement of original windows, and select doors

Grace Wong and Mart Dzheneva, OAC presented.

Ms. Dzheneva explained the building was constructed in 1909; in 2007-08 it was retrofitted, and a rooftop penthouse was added. She said the current project is to structurally stabilize the building, repair the façade and replace windows. She said the first-floor windows were replaced during the 2007 retrofit. ARC reviewed the project and at a meeting in March, requested more information. Marvin Signature

windows were proposed; they are wood with aluminum cladding with simulated divided lites.

Ms. Wong said the bricks are pulling off the façade because of water infiltration at the windows. She said the owners are not happy with the results of the 2007 building rehabilitation.

Ms. Dzheneza said the juliet balconies are not attached properly and need to be attached to brick wall. She said the 2007 retrofit made a little effort to refurbish windows and deal with water infiltration issues. She said arched terracotta is cracked and needs work. She said the EIFS cornice is cracked and has water infiltration issues. She said the veneer layer of brick is moving outward and needs to be tied into wall structure with helical ties to stabilize it.

Ms. Doherty said it would be helpful to show the entire presentation package that was submitted for the application, as there is more information to explain their desire to replace the windows. She said the rest of the building envelope would be reviewed as in-kind maintenance and repair.

Ms. Wong said the window opening steel lintels are deteriorated and can't be replaced without removing the windows. She noted the fear that once removed, the windows won't fit back into the opening after being restored.

Ms. Dzheneza said they are matching like for like and the profile won't look different aside from the curved mullion.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if all the exterior brick was coming off.

Ms. Wong said it is falling off and the project intent will stabilize brick.

Board members asked for more information about exactly what was being proposed, noting discrepancies in the materials and drawings/images provided. Board members expressed concern about straight mullion proposed to replace curved one as the windows are unique and integral to the building. A complete window survey and elevations were requested as well as a proposal to restore existing windows by a restoration expert. Other options for thermal improvement could be explored. Montlake School was noted as an example of window replacement and restoration projects.

Mmes. Wong and Dzheneza requested to table the application so that they could return with new information to respond to the Board's requests.

Tabled.

050323.4 NOMINATION

050323.41 3414-16 Fremont Avenue N

Ellen Mirro, Studio TJP presented and prepared the nomination report (full report in DON file). She noted grade changes around the building and said the alley was regraded at one point and cut off a window. She said the building was constructed in two phases. She said the north side of the basement is one level; doors between and north and south sides have been modified. Originally a bank space, the south side has a subbasement under the vault. The vault now operates as a recording studio. She said the original building permit is dated 1905 for a one-story brick bank; there was no upper floor. She said no architect or contractor are named. She provided a 1937 tax photo of the later/expanded building and noted the off-center central window. She said the lower portion of the building is unreinforced masonry (URM) and the upper portion is reinforced frame with masonry. She said storefront changes include vinyl replacement windows, modification of center stair, replacement of transom windows and storefronts, tile bulkhead was painted, and second floor brick was removed from alley side.

Ms. Mirro said there were many tenants over time with a 25-year occupancy of a bar and diner on the north side and grocer on the south. She said the upstairs was a social hall for the Fraternal Brotherhood for 11 years and was used for other purposes as well. The space is not subdivided.

Katie Jaeger, Studio TJP said the building did not meet criteria A or B. She said it may meet criterion C. She provided context of the area and history of the original inhabitants, the Duwamish through European arrival. Fremont developed rapidly in the late 1800s and was incorporated into Seattle in 1891. The neighborhood is known for its quirky public art and raucous Solstice parade. She said there are other landmarks in the vicinity including Bleitz Funeral Home. She said the fraternal organization was functionally an insurance collective. Other similar organizations with their own buildings included the Eagles, Seattle Labor Hall, Masonic Hall, Knights of Columbus, Elks, Gee How Tin Oak Association. She said organizations ranged from social clubs to trade unions and family associations.

Ms. Mirro said the typology of bank buildings uses masonry to convey traditional security and as the organizations grew, so did the buildings. She noted Seattle National Bank, Federal Reserve Bank, Puget Sound Bank of California. She noted Columbia City as a similar district with mixed use buildings. She said it is hard to say this building embodies a bank building and would not meet criterion D. She said there are few records on this building and there is no designer or building noted so it would not meet criterion E. She said the building would not meet criterion F because although visible from the bridge it is not highly visible. She said other early masonry buildings in Fremont include the 1905 Trolley Barn, 1906 Fremont Hotel among others.

Owner Comments:

Lucas de Herrera, Blueprint Capital LLC said he does not think the building rises to the level of a landmark. He said the building is a decent example but is not listed on the historic survey nor does it have integrity. He said it was originally a one-story building and is now two-stories. He said the brick veneer on the alley was removed. He said the city doesn't need middle of the road structures to be landmarked. He said this site doesn't meet residential goals, and if landmarked, there won't be any affordable units.

Ms. Chang asked for more information about the building being on the list for National Register per the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).

Ms. Mirro said the city jurisdiction is different from state and can be changeable. She said she would look it up. Mmes. Chang and Caton said it would be helpful.

Mr. Barnes said the owner's comment about housing is not relevant to what the board can consider at this time.

Jessie Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary said Mr. de Herrera brought it up because he proposes to demolish the building and build housing.

Mr. Barnes said there had been a lot of changes to the storefront and he didn't support nomination.

Mr. Macleod said he wants to see the survey mentioned and that he would support nomination. He said it is a shame Fremont is not a historic district. He noted the lovely collection of vernacular buildings in Columbia City historic district. He said storefronts change and evolve but the core remains; he noted the rhythm and composition of the façade and said this type of storefront isn't seen anymore. He said this architecture is a core part of the district while not a landmark but is part of the fabric known as Fremont. He said several businesses have left their mark here and have contributed to the mythos of Fremont as "center of the universe". He said the fraternal brotherhood use was 11 years. He wished Fremont was a historic district. He appreciated the detail of the off-center main window and said it is fascinating. He said the historic surveys are state and city historic snapshots of the city and a preliminary inventory of potential landmarks.

Mr. Barnes agreed Fremont should be a historic district and said he likes the character of all the buildings there that make not be landmarks on their own but contribute to the flavor on and impact to the neighborhood.

Mr. Macleod said he thinks the subject building is visible and stands on its own as a landmark.

Mr. Barnes said there is no character in the new buildings.

Ms. Wasserman agreed that Fremont should be a historic district. She said it is a very unusual special part of the world. She said in looking at the building's condition

and the criteria, it may meet criterion C, but she wasn't sure it could be designated. She supported the nomination.

Mr. Schmitt agreed and said it may meet criterion C and is worth further consideration.

Ms. Caton supported nomination and looked forward to additional information.

Mr. Norman appreciated the building and all the businesses it has housed. He said the building has integrity and he supported nomination of the exterior only.

Ms. Wasserman said she supported nomination of exterior only as well.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis appreciated the thorough report. She wanted to know how people associated with the building impacted Fremont as a neighborhood. She asked if the Fraternal Brotherhood was important to Fremont and what was the larger impact on people. She said it is a wonderful contributing building with character although she wasn't sure it was enough to be a landmark. She questioned what items to call out as significant and how does the building convey its significance. She said she was leaning away from nomination.

Mr. Inpanbutr said he agreed with Mr. Pheasant-Reis. He didn't want to see the neighborhood change but noted the board does not consider use. He said there is no compelling argument for nomination. He said he leaned toward not supporting.

Ms. Chang was on the fence and said the building has character and interest but is hard to fit into criteria for designation. She said she wished the building were more prominent.

Mr. Barnes said he was ambivalent about designation, but he supported nomination for further discussion.

Ms. Caton wanted to hear about the National Register information.

Mr. Barnes agreed with Ms. Caton.

Mr. Schmitt supported the nomination and said he wanted more time to consider the building. He wanted to hear community input, especially given the building's prominence in the neighborhood.

Ms. Chang said she wanted to hear about the National Register.

Ms. Doherty said the nominators can provide more information. She clarified that just because a building is missing from the City's database of surveyed properties, this does not convey anything other than it was not surveyed yet. She said the City has not reviewed every property in the city. She said there are other separate surveys from this database. She noted that she understood from public comment that the building was noted as 'eligible' for the National Register rather than being

listed on the Register. In response to a question from the Board, she confirmed that the National Register of Historic Places (Federal) is different from the Washington Heritage Register (State).

Action: I move that the Landmarks Board approve the nomination of the building at 3414-16 Fremont Avenue N for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for June 7, 2023; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/IM/HW 7:2:0 Motion carried. Mr. Inpanbutr and Ms. Pheasant-Reis opposed.

050323.5 BRIEFING

050323.51 Georgetown Steam Plant
6605 13th Avenue S
Briefing on proposed rehabilitation

Mr. Inpanbutr recused himself and left the meeting.

Mark Johnson, Signal Architecture presented (presentation materials in DON file). He provided an overview of the project goals to activate the building and provide universal access. He explained the exploration of seismic upgrade options and modifications that would do more than one thing. A hybrid seismic approach was preferred with exterior braces at northeast of building and interior braces at boiler volume. Circulation options were explored – elevators, stairs, walkways – to access all areas to help tell the story of the plant and how it operated. At least three stairs are required per code. A system of walkways will be created and only one elevator is required. He noted potential locations of stairs and why each location was preferred (see materials in DON file). They showed a number of alternatives to distribute the proposed infrastructure/circulation/egress as part of adaptive reusing the building.

Ms. Caton appreciated the presentation and was happy to see rebirth of the building.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the presentation and work. He said the options are thoughtfully considered. He posited, if an artifact is not visible, does it exist? And that he wasn't sure how to answer. He questioned what would be revealed with stair going through boiler and asked for more information.

Mr. Johnson said the boiler is full of 3-4" copper piping and is a beautiful artifact. He said it is invisible now but if a stair were to go through it, it would be visible.

Joe Sadoski, Signal Architecture said the construction of boilers is unique. Boilers are basically building size stoves with dials etc. that tell a story.

Mr. Macleod said it is a wonderful idea to peek inside the elements as traversing through the building as coal is converted into watts.

Mr. Schmitt said it is a fantastic project. He said the building was never about appearance, it was all about function. He appreciated prioritizing access to show off how artisan this process was, and he noted the educational possibilities. He said east side impacts to the building related to potential stair/elevator additions are preferable over the west side.

Ms. Wasserman said she didn't like exterior work near west side and putting exterior items on east side is preferable. She appreciated the idea of seeing the interior of one boiler. She said the building volume is her favorite 'cathedral' and she would object to anything that impacts that experience.

Mr. Macleod concurred. He said it is unlike other landmarks where the interior isn't included; this is very much about the interior, especially the turbine room. He said it is all about the voluminous space and putting circulation outside is OK. He said a stair through a boiler helps preserve that view.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis said that the building will never go back to being a steam plant. She said accessibility to all points is high on her priority list, and peeling layers back for educational purposes is OK. She said she would hate to see too much of the existing interior historic fabric removed.

Mr. Norman appreciated the presentation and said he liked the concept.

Ms. Wasserman left the meeting at 6:55 pm.

Mr. Barnes appreciated the presentation and liked the accessibility being explored. He agreed with Ms. Pheasant-Reis about no clutter to keep the historic aspect of the building.

Mr. Macleod said he leaned toward supporting the third option of interventions which is also the preferred option.

Mr. Johnson said they prefer four walkways with one central single elevator.

Mr. Macleod said the circulation concept is compelling. He appreciated away of moving through the space in a circular way.

Ms. Pheasant-Reis agreed with Ms. Wasserman and said interventions should move away from west elevation and be more on the east.

Ms. Chang said it sounds like they are still working out the preferred option. She said the 2nd and 3rd options make more sense and are less intrusive. She said to

combine this with super structure for lateral support. She looks forward to what the team comes up with. She supported the boiler use and trusted the team's consideration about minimizing changes. She said the east elevation is the least ornamental.

Ms. Doherty said it will be helpful to see the development of bridges through the cathedral space to understand what it is like. She noted Ms. Wasserman's comment, "don't mess up my cathedral". She said it will be helpful to see what the stacked walkways/bridges will really be like and how they develop architecturally and structurally – what it looks like, feels like, how what that is like in the space.

Ms. Chang asked about the timeline.

Mr. Johnson said they are in concept development right now and will have a confirmed concept this summer. He said that will be followed by fundraising, schematic design and design development.

Mr. Macleod was interested in seeing what the walkways will look like.

Mr. Johnson said the touch will be as light as it can be.

Ms. Doherty suggested a video walkthrough of the proposed circulation experience and why it is recommended.

Mr. Macleod said that would be helpful for visualizing how movement through the building will flow.

050323.6

BOARD BUSINESS