



The City of Seattle

# Landmarks Preservation Board

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

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 40/22

## MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

City Hall

Remote Meeting

Wednesday, February 2, 2022 - 3:30 p.m.

### Board Members Present

Dean Barnes

Taber Caton

Roi Chang

Kristen Johnson

Ian Macleod

Lora-Ellen McKinney

Lawrence Norman

John Rodezno

Harriet Wasserman

### Staff

Sarah Sodt

Erin Doherty

Melinda Bloom

### Absent

Russell Coney

Matt Inpanbutr

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

**In-person attendance is currently prohibited per Washington State Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28.5. Meeting participation is limited to access by the WebEx Event link or the telephone call-in line provided on agenda.**

## ROLL CALL

020222.1

PUBLIC COMMENT

Colleen McAleer, Laurelhurst Community Club said she appreciated the ownership's work with the club. She noted that Spencer Howard is their expert. She noted preference for retention of Building G which, she said is a unique building and integral to the site. She said the "gate house" at the beginning of the loop is inserted into plans and doesn't reference the site; she suggested it be removed and the space left open. She said a gatehouse is foreign to the concept originally planned. She supported clustering houses. She said some structures were very busy and that the existing architecture is quiet and refined and tucked into the landscape. She said to keep with quieter architecture without shed roofs etc.

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular said Building G is considered primary, not secondary. He said the proposal preserves only 59% of the original design, thus removing 41% of the landmark. He said the landscape was designated as a resource. He suggested fewer houses. He said an overlay of original extant trees being removed is needed and a landscape plan showing the understory to understand the landscape. He asked for circulation, topography, and understory information. He said the original design by NBBJ did not plan for this number of houses. He noted tree condition and asked for a regeneration plan. He asked for proposed new trees and said one crabapple in each yard is not enough. He said shed roof is not compatible with hipped and cross-hipped roof. He said seeing a residence at the first curve is not compatible with spatial organization. He noted views are being blocked and infilled.

**020222.2**

**MEETING MINUTES**

December 15, 2021

MM/SC/HW/DB

8:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Rodezno abstained (clarified post-meeting)

**020222.3**

**CONTROLS & INCENTIVES**

020222.31

The Fairfax

1508 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue E

Ms. Doherty noted the Controls and Incentives document was signed and proceeded to provide an overview. She said the language is similar to other agreements but noted H referencing removal or alteration of fire escape. Regarding administrative review she said the basement windows are difficult to secure and the owners are looking at inswing or fixed windows.

Mr. Macleod said it is reasonable especially regarding the lower windows.

MM/SC/IM/DB

9:0:0 Motion carried.

020222.32

Evans Pool

7201-7359 E Green Lake Drive N

Request for extension

Ms. Doherty said she has been talking with Seattle Parks and Recreation who is working on a briefing to talk about alternatives to a proposed project now that the building is designated. They have requested three-month extension.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Evans Pool 7201-7359 E Green Lake Drive N for three months.

MM/SC/DB/HW 8:0:1 Motion carried. Ms. Chang recused herself.

020222.33 Seattle Times Office Building Addition  
1120 John Street  
Request for extension

Jessica Clawson, McCullough Hill Leary said they almost have MUP. She requested extension to June 15, 2022. She said the board will review for Certificate of Approval for this block soon and will go through ARC first.

Ms. Sodt supported the extension. Responding to clarifying question she said the owners are waiting on Environmental Review and may do an earlier briefing. She said it is a large and complicated project.

Mr. Barnes asked if a delay would push out the June 15, 2022 date.

Ms. Clawson said it could and noted they didn't anticipate this extension though they are within weeks of a decision.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Seattle Times Office Building Addition, 1120 John Street to June 15, 2022.

MM/SC/ROI/HW 9:0:0 Motion carried.

020222.34 Seattle Times Printing Plant  
1120 John Street  
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Seattle Times Office Building Addition, 1120 John Street to June 15, 2022.

MM/SC/ROI/HW 9:0:0 Motion carried.

020222.35 Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co Building  
1525 11th Avenue  
Request for extension

Elizabeth Stoner explained they have a potential tenant for the White Motor Building with some possible exterior changes, primarily signage.

Ms. Sodt said the White Motor Building is adjacent to this building and she said she was comfortable with three-month extension, to May 4, 2022.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Kelly-Springfield Building, 1525 11th Avenue to May 4, 2022.

MM/SC/IM/HW 9:0:0 Motion carried.

020222.36 White Motor Company Building  
1021 E. Pine Street  
Request for extension

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for White Motor Company Building, 1021 E. Pine Street to May 4, 2022.

MM/SC/DB/HW 9:0:0 Motion carried.

020222.37 Knights of Columbus  
700-722 E. Union Street  
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained request for extension to June 15, 2022. She said she supported the extension and noted she has been working with the project architect for seismic retrofit. She said that board will likely see the project within a couple months and said it is a holistic retrofit of the building.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Knights of Columbus, 700-722 E. Union Street until June 15, 2022.

MM/SC/IM/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

020222.38 The Showbox  
1426 First Avenue  
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt explained the requested for extension to June 15, 2022. She supported the request and said questions about the financial analysis are still being addressed.

Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary said he concurred and noted the operator had ceased operations due to Covid and noted the work to keep the building occupied.

Ms. Wasserman said it has been a long time and she was eager to see progress so would support the request.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Showbox, 1426 First Avenue to June 15, 2022.

MM/SC/HW/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

020222.39 Lloyd Building  
601 Stewart Street  
Request for extension

Mr. McCullough said Kilroy acquired the property and has plans to preserve the Lloyd Building to a new structure to the south. He said the project is in early design guidance and the EDG with Design Review Board passed the first meeting. He said they are filing the MUP in the next couple months. He said they will file for Certificate of Approval and will have ARCs to go through the elements of the building, likely starting in May. He requested an extension to September 21, 2022.

Ms. Sodt said she was supportive of extension request. She said the project is moving along with briefings and permitting. The Design Review Board was told of ARC support; she confirmed with Review Board that was accurate.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for the Lloyd Building, 601 Stewart Street to September 21, 2022.

MM/SC/IM/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

020222.310 Donahoe Building / Bergman Luggage  
1901-1911 3rd Avenue  
Request for extension

Ms. Sodt said the owner died and said she was supportive of request for extension to June 15, 2022. She noted the challenge of connecting with the representative. She said she is keeping this on the same timeline as White Garage.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for Donahoe Building / Bergman Luggage, 1901-1911 3rd Avenue to June 15, 2022.

MM/SC/IM/HW 9:0:0 Motion carried.

020222.311 White Garage  
1915 Third Avenue  
Request for extension

Mr. McCullough explained the project with this and the Donahoe Building when Donahoe Building owner Brook Barnes died. He explained the effort to try to consolidate the two properties to resuscitate the prior concept.

Action: I move to defer consideration of Controls and Incentives for White Garage, 1915 Third Avenue until June 15, 2022.

MM/SC/IM/HW 9:0:0 Motion carried.

**020222.4 CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

*Mr. Norman left the meeting.*

*Ms. Caton recused herself and moved off the panel and into the audience.*

020222.41 Battelle Memorial Institute / Talaris Conference Center  
4000 NE 41<sup>st</sup> Street  
Briefing on proposed development

Presentation documents and videos in DON files.

Jim Keller, Site Workshop presented a 2004 Richard Haag, original landscape designer of the site. He noted that landscapes change and always change. He said a 1965 survey of the site indicated the lake level used to be higher with Yesler Creek running through the site. He said Yesler Creek now runs through a below grade pipe. He said the survey shows 9' of lake shore became available for development. He said the site was riparian and he noted the clusters of buildings located on a higher portion of the site. He said pedestrian pathways were insular and meant for research, contemplation. He said a master plan showed future development with new buildings within the forest. He said buildings E, F, and G were constructed in the 1970s. He noted buildings, trees and groves as defining elements of the site.

He said that Haag proposed commercial development to the north of the site and explored how to create an insular effect. He said vegetation was overplanted including Lombardi Poplars which grow fast. He said over time many of the Poplars needed to be removed; 29 remain. He said a primary defining element was the Oak grove which provided canopy, shade. There are 394 trees. He said other trees that aren't thriving will be eliminated to save as many of the Oaks as possible. He said 14 Weeping Willows were planted, two remain and define the heart of the campus. He said more are proposed for this project. He said Honey Locusts which thrive on the east side of the mountains, don't work as well here. He said he thinks Haag was hopeful they would thrive; ten remain.

Mr. Keller said Scots Pines throughout the Oak grove are in varied condition; 34 remain and those in good condition would be saved. He said there are five varieties of Crab Apple on the site clusters around residential buildings and Oak grove; they are reaching the end of their life. He said that invasive species are taking over.

Katherine Taylor, Tree Solutions talked about the condition of the urban forest on this site and starting her work on the site in 2018, returning each year to evaluate tree health. Noted it is as a living landscape and said the trees are in various stages of maturity, morphology and condition, and are going to continue to change over time. In their tree inventory / assessment they worked to identify the most valuable parts of the landscape that can continue to thrive for decades to come. She said 27

trees have died since 2018 and 75 are in declining condition due to species, age, impacts from weather impacts, growing conditions, disease and insects/pests. Most of the failing trees are outside of the Oak and conifer groves. She said new infrastructure is planned in areas where trees are in poor condition. She went over a detailed account of Oak, Willow, Poplar, Crab Apple, pine, Douglas Fir, Birch, Alder, Cottonwood trees. She said invasive species are taking over and that restoration is important. She said conifer and Oak groves would not be developed and would be retained.

Mr. Keller went over trees from Haag's original plan and noted those being retained. He said 48 new homes are proposed with residents becoming new stewards of the landscape. He said there is a strong heart to the campus and proposed replacing Building G with architectural home frontage, restoring ponds and bridges, and adding improved ADA access. He proposed preservation of the Oak grove and historic pedestrian networks with addition of new. He said the addition to Building D helps enhance and frame part of the campus. He said the campus becomes extroverted rather than introverted. He said the wetland and natural area were meant for development; the landscape will be restored and invasives removed. He said the site would have lower density than the surrounding neighborhood. He said what they have called the 'gatehouse' is not a gate house and there would be no gates to site.

A virtual flyover was shown.

Board Comments:

Ms. Wasserman appreciated that the 'gatehouse' was in name only and that this would not be a gated community.

Messrs. Rodezno and Macleod asked how finished the design is at this point.

Dan Miles said it is conceptual at this point and they are nowhere near done designing the homes. He said they are at form and volume studies.

Mr. Barnes asked the garage location for proposed houses at the Building G location.

Mr. Miles said garage access is on the back, with alley approach.

Mr. Keller said building clusters have always been planned in wetland area. He noted trees to be retained, which have failed. He pointed out invasive species zone in the southwest area.

Mr. Barnes asked if a lot of the Oak grove would remain.

Mr. Keller said yes.

Ms. Wasserman thanked the presenters and noted the presentation was very helpful especially the fly-through for orienting. She said she was bothered by the gatehouse and preferred a quieter entry. She preferred replacing some of the proposed single-family houses with small condominiums, fourplexes etc.

Ms. McKinney said gatehouses always bothered her as she is supposed to be on the other side of them. She appreciated the careful consideration of landscape which is living; it is not smart to cut down a tree because it will tell us when it is ready to go. She appreciated the planning and said we need trees to breathe. There are some places in the country where there is no arboreal cover or groundcover and people are sicker and less able to manage their lives due to all of the concrete and heat. There are consequences to these decisions.

Mr. Macleod agreed with Ms. McKinney's comments. He said that while he understands this is private property, it has been a public resource. He appreciated the sensitivity to landscape design and history, and the extensive details about the trees. He said after tour he meandered into the wetland; it is a special place, and he was glad to see it emphasized because it is a special place and needs help. He appreciated seeing the evolution of the landscape and protection of overall character rather than individual trees. He said the 'gatehouse' is troubling and said the symbolic gesture doesn't suit the rest of the site and should be reworked. He said Building G is the 'ugly duckling' of the existing buildings. He appreciated the proposed plans but noted that Building G is a unique building that frames the pond, and he was hesitant to see it go away because when it is gone when it is gone. He said it is a ridiculously strange building to try to occupy, but he would still like to hear more about preserving it if possible. He said he had no problem with removal of the other building - E. He said he supports the proposed addition to Building D and thinks it is a natural fit. He suggested echoing the cottage 'Uplands' in the southwest corner; a special moment that could be echoed elsewhere.

Mr. Barnes agreed with Mr. Macleod about Building A, B and C. He appreciated the cafeteria, D and E all combined in one area and with commercial uses in one grouping. He said the Building D addition is the best place to put it. He said the 'gatehouse' should be named differently or the house shouldn't be there at all. But recognizes the feasibility. He said the design is getting better, but still struggles with all the houses proposed for the property because it is an Audubon type area. He appreciated the work and the process, and understands the age issues with many of the trees which will not be there much longer.

Ms. Chang echoed her colleagues' comments. She appreciated the thorough presentation, models and flyover video. She said the plan gives a lot of thought to the loss of trees. She asked how long until the new vegetation looks like the drawing representation. She noted ivy and overgrowth and said lots of cleanup is needed, observed during the site tour. She expressed concern about the five houses on south side of pond which feels more like a public area. She said that impacted view is her biggest concern, as it makes it feel more residential, than community.



Mr. Keller said it will take 10-15 years for plantings to mature to model representation.

Mr. Rodezno noted the helpful information about the trees and said he appreciated the model and flyover video. He preferred to see the preservation of Building G site and fewer proposed houses, but understands the feasibility need.

Ms. Johnson said there have been many requests for the overall landscape plan and review. She appreciated the thorough arborist review and what was presented. She said removal of a number of trees is unsettling, but the reasoning is helpful. She said the fly through was really helpful to visualize and think about the site. She would like the 'gatehouse' taken out because doesn't fit with the groupings. She said the character of the place will change. She said the quiet center is part of its specialness. She said she was comfortable with removal of Building G which she said was cool, but not useful. She said stepping of new roofs there could reflect that.

Ms. Doherty asked Mr. Macleod to offer more comment about the scale and character of buildings A, B, C, Uplands.

Mr. Macleod said he appreciated the way buildings A, B, C relate to each other and to contours of the land; it is unique and very 'Haag-ian'. He said there is dialog between all the buildings in this area. He said the other new houses are just lined up, suburban, and are very regular. He said A, B, and C have a dialogue with one another. He said there could be alternative pattern of garages, a different relationship with those buildings and not all lined up. He said that is the character of existing buildings on the site. He said the spaces are defined by where the buildings are laid out, as opposed to seeing these buildings be placed wherever they fit.

Nathan Rimmer said the spaces are created by the buildings. He said there is a mature landscape, and they have to figure a way to weave these things into a mature landscape. He said they are working through a balance of the most appropriate location of new houses, to tuck them in where there is space.

Mr. Macleod noted the grade change from top to bottom of 41<sup>st</sup> down to 'pond' house area (Mr. Keller said 14 feet), and how the buildings play with the grade, and all look out so there is a sense of privacy. He said a great moment in the site the reflects the courtyard. He said to understand the constraints of the existing landscape, and that finances is an issue.

Mr. Rimmer said those are great thoughts. He said if road were to be moved, Oak trees would have to be removed so they left the road as is due to constraints of the landscape.

Mr. Macleod said they are on the right track. He said they could start to work with theme when they get to house detail when details start to form. Garages moved to the back is good.

Bob Baldwin said they like to feel things are moving forward and it seems like there is a general consensus moving in the right direction. He said more will be coming shortly.

**020222.5**

**STAFF REPORT**