



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 490/22

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, December 21, 2022 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Matt Inpanbutr

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lawrence Norman

Padraic Slattery

Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Roi Chang

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Marc Schmitt

Acting Chair Kristen Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

122122.1

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

122122.2

MEETING MINUTES

September 21, 2022

MM/SC/IM/DB

4:0:2 Minutes approved. Messrs. Inpanbutr and Norman abstained.

Ms. Wasserman joined the meeting at 3:35pm.

October 5, 2022

MM/SC/MI/DB

6:0:1 Minutes approved. Ms. Johnson abstained.

122122.3

CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL

122122.31

Fire Station 13

3601 Beacon Avenue S

Proposed selective window replacement

Matt Aalfs, BuildingWork explained the original steel windows were replaced in the 1980s with an aluminum system, some of which have failed and need to be replaced. He provided detailed photos of current conditions and noted failed seals and water intrusion. He said the proposed fiberglass replacement windows would have a similar profile and it is a quality product. He said the new windows would provide a significant acoustical upgrade, as well as improved function and thermal performance.

Mr. Inpanbutr asked if the cast stone will remain. He asked if they considered looking to provide a window more similar to the original steel window, rather than the 1980s aluminum installation.

Mr. Aalfs said the sills will remain. He said they looked at steel replacement windows, but the project was too small for one major steel window fabricator in the US. He said they are making the new sashes to look like the 1980s configuration to be compatible with the other replacement windows on the building that will remain. He said the windows were selected for acoustic and energy performance for the sleeping room use.

Eileen McHugh, City of Seattle Facilities & Administrative Services (FAS) said operability of windows is important to maintain emergency egress out of the sleeping rooms.

Ms. Wasserman said the alternatives and proposal were well-researched and well-thought out. She said if original windows were being replaced, she would be fussier, but these are replacing replacements. She said the applicant has done a good job and the new windows will meet various user needs.

Mr. Macleod agreed. He said having similar appearance of a divided light sash is a nice touch. He said the applicant looked through all options.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application and issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed selective

replacement of windows at Fire Station 13, 3601 Beacon Avenue S, 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.*
 - a. The existing windows proposed for replacement have been previously altered and are not original. The historic steel windows were removed in the 1980s. The window openings are original, with the exception of the east end, previously altered in the 1980s project.
 - b. The dimensions and profiles of the proposed fiberglass window components are slightly different than the non-historic windows aluminum windows they are proposed to emulate, but the overall proportion and operation would be similar to the existing non-historic condition.
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 did not present alternatives, as they are seeking a higher level of thermal and acoustical performance specific to the proposed fiberglass window product.
3. The factors of SMC 25.12 .750 C, D and E are not applicable.

MM/SC/IM/HW 7:0:0 Motion carried.

122122.4 DESIGNATION

122122.41 University of Washington Anderson Hall
3715 W Stevens Way NE

Mr. Inpanbutr recused himself and moved from the panel to the audience.

Katie Pratt, NW Vernacular provided context of the building within the University campus and overall neighborhood. She said Anderson Hall was built in 1925 for use by the Department of Forestry. The building is in the south portion of the central campus. The main entrance is on the north facade fronting W Stevens Way NE. Bloedel Hall and Winkenwerder Forest Sciences Laboratory, built in 1971 and 1963, are immediately south of the subject building. The intervening courtyard was built in 1971 as part of Bloedel Hall. Due to the site slope, only two of the building's three stories are visible above grade on the front north façade. Photographs provided showed views looking south along the east facade, looking east along the north

facade, and looking northwest from the Bloedel Hall courtyard; she noted the site landscaping shortly after construction of the building. The landscape is characterized by lawn between the sidewalks and building with small columnar conifers close to the base of the building. A 1965 photograph shows Anderson Hall with landscape retaining the front lawn with the sidewalk along W Stevens Way NE added circa 1964. The hedge along the front walkway was added circa 1964 and redesigned circa 2005. The Winkenwerder Forest Sciences Laboratory and connecting arcade remain behind Anderson Hall. A 1968 site plan shows the design for the Bloedel Courtyard along with proposed foundation plantings along the south, east, and west sides of Anderson Hall. No changes were made to the north lawn. She provided an image showing existing conditions as of 2021 with dense vegetation growth along the foundation of Anderson Hall that was not visible in 1965 and 1973 photographs, and departs from the original lawn and low plantings characteristic of the circa 1925 plantings.

Ms. Pratt said the building has an H-shaped plan. Massing consists of a three-story, side-gable main portion with a flat ridge and short cross-gable ends. The building has a concrete column and beam structure, floors, and roof deck. Exterior walls are clad with cast stone, reddish in color, with a smooth finish, and face brick with a raked finish and having a range of warm brown tones, including dark and light brown, and cream. Mortar joints are deeply recessed. The roofs are steeply pitched and clad with a variegated green color slate with copper cresting. Steel sash windows with lead division bars with fixed and casement operation with bronze latch hardware.

She said art glass is used in the gable end windows on the north facade and at the transom above the main north entrance. Windows installed as part of the 1968 renovation matched the existing windows and occur on the south facade at the former log laboratory entrance and former ground and first story arcade connections. The building originally had south entrances at the ground and first story levels connecting to an arcade providing access to the former log laboratory. The main north entrance features an enclosed entrance porch clad with cast stone with the building name "Alfred H. Anderson Hall" cast in raised lettering, oak veneer doors, an artificial Caen stone finish at the lobby with niches on either side, and a plaster ribbed vaulted ceiling and light fixtures with amber glass lenses. The east, southeast, and southwest entrances were added as part of the 1968 Renovation.

Anderson Hall was designed by Bebb and Gould in the Collegiate Gothic style. The interior layout generally consists of a double-loaded east-west corridor within the main portion that connects to spaces at the cross-gable ends. Stairways at either end of the corridor provide vertical circulation. Perimeter spaces consist of offices and classrooms. The second floor contains the two-story reading room and the lecture hall volumes.

Ms. Pratt said the first floor is the main building floor. Originally the floor provided mostly classroom space with offices and a library. Office finishes consist of vinyl composition floor tiles and carpeting, painted gypsum board walls with rubber and

painted wood bases, and acoustical tile drop ceilings. The corridor retains a terrazzo floor with tile border and plaster and artificial Caen stone wall finishes. She detailed elements on photo of the Reading Room and noted the ceiling, wall, fireplace, carved detailing, and the balcony. She said steel trusses spanning the room are encased with stained wood. The fireplace has a cast stone mantel with a projecting copper heat shield. She said carpet extends throughout the room and pendant light fixtures were added in 1991.

Photographs from within the Lecture Hall along the west side of the building show the artificial hammered beam roof, comprised of steel trusses enclosed with wood millwork. The ceiling between the trusses is finished with false beams enclosing steel framing. She said pendant fixtures were added in 1997. Wood slabs hung on walls were added in 1957. The raised platform and angled wall were added in 1976. Added carpeting extends throughout the space. She said that interior work has regularly upgraded interior finishes and systems to sustain ongoing educational use. Photographs showed typical conditions at the second and ground floor corridors along with the added stairway and the east entrance.

Ms. Pratt said both the new and original university campuses are located within the ancestral land of the Duwamish Tribe. The Duwamish and other Native Coast Salish peoples of the Puget Sound region have lived in the area, including what is now the university campus, since time immemorial. A map from the book *Native Seattle*, showed important sites and villages in the area. One of the closest villages to the present-day university campus was located near University Village. The name of this village loosely translates to “Little Canoe Channel,” in the Lushootseed language. The area was a prairie, where roots were cultivated and gathered. The arrival of white Euro-Americans in the greater Puget Sound region in the early 1800s led to the colonization and settlement of the land where the university stands, profoundly changing the ways of life for the Duwamish and other Native peoples. At least one epidemic had swept through the area by the time George Vancouver sailed into the Salish Sea in 1792 – the first smallpox epidemic killed at least 30 percent of the Native population on the Northwest coast of North America. Waves of disease continued to sicken and weaken the area’s Native people well into the 19th century with five separate epidemics by 1850.

When the Denny Party arrived in Seattle in 1852, the Native American population in the area had already been significantly reduced due to disease. But negative impacts to the lifeways of local tribes only continued as more white Euro-Americans arrived and sought to settle and claim the lands of the Coast Salish. In addition to the Little Canoe Channel village, there were several thriving villages, marked by longhouses, within the present-day boundaries of Seattle. Washington Territory was established in 1853 and Washington Territorial Governor Isaac I. Stevens held a series of treaty conferences with Native Americans living within the newly established territory in the 1850s. These conferences were to persuade Native Peoples to give up their lands to the U.S. Government and move onto designated reservations. The Treaty of Point Elliott in 1855 was signed by representatives of the Duwamish, Suquamish, and Snohomish people and created the Tulalip, Port

Madison, Swinomish, and Lummi reservations. The Duwamish did not receive their own reservation.

Ms. Pratt said the University of Washington began as Washington Territorial University in 1861 just six years after the Treaty of Point Elliott. It was the first university in the territory and was originally located on a 10-acre parcel of land in present-day downtown but at the time was on the outskirts of the growing city. The university became the University of Washington in 1889 the same year Washington gained statehood. As the university grew, it also began to outgrow its original campus. A new site was found along Union Bay in 1891, the site where the University exists today. Plans were made to guide the layout of the new campus over the years, including A. H. Fuller's Oval Plan in 1898 and the Olmsted's plan for the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition in 1909. The construction of Anderson Hall ties in with the Regents Plan of 1915 in its use of Collegiate Gothic and its siting near the plan's proposed Science Quadrangle. Local architect and founder of the university's newly formed architecture department, Carl F. Gould, designed this new campus plan, which became the guiding document for the university for the next two decades.

She said the Regents Plan followed a simplified version of the Beaux Arts design of the Olmsted's plan. Collegiate Gothic was established as the predominant architectural style for new construction on campus, which persisted into the 1950s. The established groupings of buildings on campus: the liberal arts programs were on the Upper Campus, administrative and library facilities were on a quadrangle at the center of campus, and science programs went along Rainier Vista and southern campus. Anderson Hall and its related building, the Forest Products Laboratory, were positioned in the southern portion campus adjacent to Rainier Vista.

Ms. Pratt said construction of Anderson Hall – to be the new forestry building – was funded by a \$250,000 donation in 1923 to university by Agnew Healy Anderson, widow of the late lumberman Alfred H. Anderson. Anderson, originally from Wisconsin, arrived in Washington in 1889 and worked as a logger in Mason County with S. G. Simpson. Anderson then formed the Peninsular Railroad Company and the Mason County Logging Company, expanding his influence and wealth in the region's timber industry. He also served as a state legislator beginning in 1891, advocating for a larger University of Washington (UW) campus and its establishment at its current location. After he relocated his family from Shelton to Seattle in 1892, he continued to broaden his business interests to banks and breweries. When he died in 1914, his estate was valued at just over \$2 million. His wife, Agnew, became the sole owner of their joint estate, the bulk of which consisted of timber company holdings, including the Simpson Logging Company, Phoenix Logging Company and Mason County Logging company. Given Anderson's ties to the timber industry and support of the UW, it was a natural choice for Agnes to want to memorialize her husband's legacy through a new forestry building for the university's new and growing program.

The UW's School of Forestry was founded in 1907 and highlighted in 1909 during the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition (AYPE). In 1910, the College of Forestry was formed

with Hugo Winkenwerder named as dean in 1912, a position he held until 1945. When Agnes made her gift to the university, the College of Forestry had continued to grow since its founding. The Board of Regents accepted her gift and hired architects Bebb & Gould to design the new building. Construction began in May 1924.

Ms. Pratt said the new building was sited between the Liberal Arts and Science quads. The construction contract for the building was \$235,000. An arcaded passageway connected the new building to the Bebb & Gould designed Forest Sciences Laboratory, and to the later Bloedel Hall. Anderson Hall was finished in the fall of 1925 with a dedication ceremony held on October 27, 1925. The grounds around Anderson Hall were developed later, between 1930-32. The university's landscape architect, Butler Sturtevant, who held the position from 1931-39 directed the landscape efforts.

Courses in general forestry were first taught at the University of Washington in 1897. The school was among the earliest schools of forestry in the United States. Academic forestry programs emerged for several reasons, but most notably as a result of concerns regarding depletion of the country's forests and the rise of the conservation movement. The School of Forestry, highlighted during the 1909 AYPE, became the College of Forestry in 1910. Hugo Winkenwerder (1878-1947), a white forestry professor originally from Wisconsin, was appointed dean of the College of Forestry in 1912. He served in that position until his retirement in 1945. Winkenwerder also briefly served as acting President of the University between 1933 and 1934.

Ms. Pratt said a new academic program, both at the University of Washington and other universities in the nation, there were a variety of approaches to early forestry education. The Society of American Foresters, established in 1900, became a critical organization in establishing educational standards. Conferences in 1910 and 1920 set forth curricular standards with growing and cultivating trees with protection and utilization as the foundation for a general forestry education. Even in 1930, there remained debate over the meaning of forestry as it was still a new field of study. The college continued to grow over the next several decades, becoming the College of Forest Resources in 1967. Additional programs were added both on and off campus. Research funding increased during the 1980s and into the 2000s. And in 2009, the College of Forest Resources became the School of Forest Resources, a founding unit of the new College of the Environment. Programs including the Washington Pulp and Paper Foundation (1968), Center for Quantitative Science in Fisheries, Forestry & Wildlife (1968), the National Park Service's Cooperative Park Studies Unit (1970), and the Center for Urban Horticulture (1980).

Ms. Pratt said the architecture firm Bebb & Gould designed Anderson Hall. Carl F. Gould and Charles H. Bebb, both white men, established their firm in 1914. Bebb's involvement with the firm was limited following 1924 and the partnership dissolved upon Gould's death in 1939. The firm prepared a campus plan for the University of Washington, called the Regents Plan of 1915. This plan established the general aesthetic and Collegiate Gothic architectural style that dominated campus

construction for the next 40 years. Bebb & Gould were responsible for the designs of 28 buildings on the University of Washington campus alone.

Ms. Pratt said Butler Stevens Sturtevant, a white man, was born in Wisconsin. In 1918 he enrolled at what is now known as UCLA to study in the school's horticulture program. While there, he worked for local landscape architects. He graduated in 1921 and briefly worked with Theodore Payne, a California native plants specialist. He continued his education in 1922, enrolling in the Harvard University Graduate School of Landscape. He completed his courses, but not his thesis, and did not earn his degree. He moved back to California in 1924 and worked with a local firm. After several short-term positions at various offices around the country, Sturtevant moved to Seattle in 1928. He set up his own office and began to work with Bebb & Gould on the Normandy Park Subdivision Master Plan (1928–1929). Sturtevant also designed the Rose Garden at Butchart Gardens in Victoria, British Columbia (1928–1933), and a courtyard at the Seattle Children's Orthopedic Hospital. He then became the landscape architect for the University of Washington from 1931 to 1939. Following his work there, he became the campus landscape architect for Principia College in Illinois until 1969.

Ms. Pratt said other Bebb and Gould buildings in the University of Washington campus include Raitt and Savery Halls, Miller Hall, Bagley Hall, Suzzallo Library, Hutchison Hall among others. Outside the campus, Bebb and Gould buildings include Puget Sound News Company Building, Times Square Building, and the former US Marine Hospital among others.

She said Anderson Hall was designed in the Collegiate Gothic style; the style recommended in Bebb & Gould's 1915 Regents Plan. Collegiate Gothic is the institutional/educational counterpart to the Tudor Revival architectural style used on residences. Common features of Collegiate Gothic buildings include masonry construction, stepped or crenelated parapet(s), Gothic arched entrances, towers and bay windows, cast stone tracery, decorative panels and finials and steeply pitched, varied rooflines. Anderson Hall features all of these elements. Other campus buildings in this style include Raitt Hall, Art Hall, Hutchison Hall and Savery Hall.

Ms. Doherty said that features identified at the nomination meeting are included in the Staff Report and are identified on a staff prepared site plan (using an underlay drawn by Northwest Vernacular). She clarified that a portion of vaulted ceiling had been removed from the recommended features, as it was confirmed to have been previously demolished. She said that some features in the designated interiors, such as existing audio-visual, light fixtures could be excluded in the controls and incentives negotiations. Ms. Doherty also clarified that the recommended site boundary had been made smaller on the back (south) side of the building.

Ms. Wasserman appreciated staff identification of included areas. She appreciated the presentation and said she supported designation as noted in Staff Report, criteria C, D, and E.

Mr. Barnes supported designation and said there are not too many buildings from this era in such good shape. He agreed with the Staff Report.

Mr. Macleod concurred and said everything Bebb and Gould did was fantastic. He appreciated staff's work to identify interior features included. He said there are a lot of buildings with nothing left inside and noted the Lecture Hall and its vaulted ceiling was fantastic. He agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation on criteria C, D, and E.

Mr. Norman said he agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation on criteria C, D, and E.

Mr. Slattery supported designation.

Ms. Johnson supported designation and noted University of Washington takes great care of its beautiful buildings. She said so much interior remains and said one can almost get an idea of what it was like to go there 100 years ago. She said it is a lovely building, characteristic of the time. She agreed with the Staff Report and supported designation on criteria C, D, and E.

Mr. Macleod said it is interesting that for all the ways higher education has changed, these spaces are not functionally obsolete and still have purpose.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the University of Washington Anderson Hall at 3715 E Stevens Way NE for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, D, and E; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: a portion of the site as illustrated in the staff's drawing; the exterior of the building; and a portion of the building interior, including: the First Floor main entryway and hall with vaulted ceilings (as illustrated in the staff's drawing), the east and west stairs from the Ground Floor up through the Third Floor (excluding the adjacent hallways), the Reading Room at the Second and Third Floors, and the Auditorium at the Second and Third Floors.

MM/SC/DB/HW 6:0:1 Motion carried. Mr. Inpanbutr recused.

Julie Blakeslee thanked board members.

Ms. Taber joined the meeting approximately 4:40pm.

122122.5 BRIEFING

122122.51 Georgetown Steam Plant
6605 13th Avenue S
Briefing on proposed rehabilitation

David Strauss, SHKS Architects explained that the Georgetown Steam Plant Community Development Authority (GTSPCDA) will manage the day-to-day operations of the building for owner Seattle City Light. He said they plan to make the facility an interpretive center with focus on arts and education and engaging the underserved. He said they will focus on the continued preservation of the building. He said the group has been in contact with the Landmarks Preservation Board, and DAHP. He said initially the building was listed as a National Mechanical Engineering Landmark in 1980, and later a Seattle Landmark, and a National Historic Landmark. He said the goals of the project are to tell the story of the Georgetown Steam Plant, reactivate the building, reprogram the use, make upgrades for life safety and seismic performance, and to provide universal access.

Mr. Strauss said the proposed ground plane improvements include bioswales, green infrastructure and some soils remediation. He said they will come back to focus on character contributing façades. He said the building is cast in place concrete and proceeded to go over façade elements and details of the building. He said the south elevation was originally obscured. He explained how coal was brought into the building and into the boilers and processed. He said there were three turbines; two remain and are the only of their kind in existence. He pointed out concrete spalling and damage in the Ash Room. He presented a rendering showing changes to the building over time and noted the smokestacks were removed and smaller versions installed. He said oil tanks and storage areas were not shown. He explained that the rerouting of the Duwamish River is a big part of the history of the site.

Mark Johnson, Signal Architecture + Research went through Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (SOI) and said it will be the foundation for principle of design going forward. He proposed to find new use, retain historic character, differentiate new work from old and maintain unique, character-defining features. Rehabilitation work will comply with the SOI. He noted challenges with access in an industrial environment and how to get to where they want to be with full universal access using stairs, ramps, landings, elevator. He said studies will explore the interior, exterior elements to reach that in addition to plumbing, fire suppression, and new stair cores.

Mr. Strauss explained the goal of seismic retrofit and noted seismic life safety is the biggest issue they face. He said there is potential joint and pile failure in the concrete frame building. He noted there are not competent soils and in an earthquake the building could shift off the piles or topple over. He said options are being explored to protect the building without impacts to exterior versus interior defining elements. He said it is a trade-off between the interior and exterior but that the possibility of a hybrid solution is being explored. He noted exploration of localized bracing to minimize impacts to features and showed photo examples of interior solutions at other sites. He proposed to use as light a touch as possible and still be able to activate the building.

Ms. Doherty noted that the first briefing is at a high-level to introduce the project.

Mr. Norman asked about costs.

Mr. Johnson said they aren't sure at this point, and noted they are working with a building contractor to evaluate feasibility and construction cost.

Mr. Macleod said he's been in the building, and it is an exciting project. He asked about programming requirements if known at this point.

Mr. Johnson said possibilities are being explored.

Sam Farrazaino, GTSPCDA said investments in building will be investments in possibilities. He said the group would collaborate with community to identify possibilities and how to fund them.

Genevieve Hale Case, GTSPCDA said they would explore what the community wants – interactive events, STEM programming, event space. She said they have used an online community engagement tool and have events planned as well.

Mr. Macleod said it sounds like activation will inform design, and a clearer discussion of program can happen in the future.

Mr. Johnson said they are identifying risk, impact, and what would be acceptable.

Mr. Macleod appreciated the presentation and noted the code is driving the required minimal impact work.

Mr. Strauss said they are in early meetings with Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) and they are not compelled to comply with energy requirements because of the designated features of the Landmarks. He said they still want to identify a certain level of occupant comfort.

Ms. Caton appreciated seeing successful adaptive reuse of other power plants and said it bodes well for this project. She said seismic improvements will enhance the building.

Ms. Wasserman said it is a lovely beginning of a story. She said she saw the building more than 30 years ago when events were held there. She said they toured and climbed all over the building. She said it is very nice with a cathedral feel.

Mr. Farrazaino said Historic Seattle is part of the team.

Ms. Johnson said she has seen the building previously for small projects, and it is nice to see that it will become more usable. She said a lot can probably be removed and still retain its character. She said it is an individual building which could lend itself to bracing inside and out. She said it is nice to have an early briefing of the project.

Mr. Macleod said the building has sat unused since it was decommissioned. He said he is glad to see the project get off the ground. He noted how contentious Gas

Works Park was when that transformation started. He said to let the building decide what it wants to be and not to force a rigorous program on it. He said there is proof that it is possible to reinvigorate the building.

Ms. Doherty said she sent the board members the Seattle City Light webpage that hosts 3-D tour and videos for additional context. She will do a poll of the Board members to see who would be interested in a building tour. She said the applicant has provided a more detailed document on different ways to approach the seismic upgrade and she will share that before the site visit. The applicant will then come back to the Board to provide a brief on the detailed structural content and seismic retrofit alternatives.

Mr. Schmitt appreciated the input.

Mr. Farrazaino said it is a National Historic Landmark which needs community involvement.

122122.6

BOARD BUSINESS